

## SENATE.

MONDAY, January 24, 1916.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thy peace lies deeper than the noise and confusion of the world's dread alarm. Thy peace is as a tide, too deep for sound and foam. We know that the world's peace waits upon the peace of God in the hearts of men. We come before Thee to open our hearts, that our minds and hearts may be kept in perfect peace by Thy grace, that we may know that which passeth knowledge of the peace of God in our hearts. Grant, we pray, that with calmness of thought and with a devotion to the highest interests of mankind we can quietly and consistently with Thy will perform the duties of this day. For Christ's sake. Amen.

EDWIN C. BURLEIGH, a Senator from the State of Maine, appeared in his seat to-day.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday last was read and approved.

## DISPOSITION OF USELESS PAPERS (H. DOC. NO. 613).

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of documents and files of papers in the Department of Commerce which are not needed or are useful in the transaction of current business and which have no permanent value or historical interest. The communication and accompanying papers will be referred to the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments, and the Chair appoints the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. LANE] the committee on the part of the Senate. The Secretary will notify the House of Representatives of the appointment thereof.

## LIST OF CLAIMS (S. DOC. NO. 97).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting, pursuant to the order of the court, a list of cases referred to the court by resolution of the Senate under the act of March 3, 1887, known as the Tucker Act, which cases were dismissed by the court on the motion of the claimants' attorneys, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (H. R. 9416) making appropriations to supply further urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and prior years, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also transmitted to the Senate resolutions of the House on the death of Hon. JOSEPH A. GOULDEN, late a Representative from the State of New York.

## ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

S. 1773. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River at or near Warfield, Ky., and Kermit, W. Va.;

H. R. 4716. An act to authorize Dunklin County, Mo., and Clay County, Ark., to construct a bridge across St. Francis River; and

H. R. 6448. An act to authorize Butler and Dunklin Counties, Mo., to construct a bridge across St. Francis River.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. SHAFROTH presented a petition of sundry citizens of Two Buttes, Colo., praying for the formation of a United States of the world, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. FLETCHER presented petitions of sundry citizens of Florida praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution granting the right of suffrage to women, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. SHEPPARD presented memorials of sundry citizens of Texas, remonstrating against an increase in armaments, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. THOMPSON presented memorials of sundry citizens of Lyon, Allen, Sedgwick, Reno, Coffee, Sumner, and Dewey Counties, all in the State of Kansas, remonstrating against a tax on gasoline, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Fairview, Salina, Pretty Prairie, and Altoona, all in the State of Kansas, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation requiring revenue stamps to be placed on individual bank checks, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the faculty and students of Fairmount College and Church, Wichita, Kans., remonstrating against an increase in armaments, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. OLIVER. I send to the desk a short communication from the Pennsylvania State Association of Dyers and Cleaners requesting action looking to an investigation of the causes of the advanced price of gasoline. I ask that the communication be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the communication was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PENNSYLVANIA STATE ASSOCIATION OF DYERS AND CLEANERS,  
Pittsburgh, Pa., January 18, 1916.

HON. GEORGE T. OLIVER.

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At a convention of the Pennsylvania State Association of Dyers and Cleaners held in Wilkes-Barre, Pa., a few days ago, a resolution was passed favoring an investigation by the Government of the rapid and continuous increase in the price of "gasoline" by the refiners. Our industry uses millions of gallons of this article and we believe the present advance of practically 100 per cent is uncalled for. I, as secretary of the association, was instructed to bring this matter to your notice.

Thanking you in advance for any trouble we may cause you,  
I remain,

THOMAS W. MURPHY.

Secretary Pennsylvania State Association of Dyers and Cleaners.

Mr. OLIVER presented a petition of sundry citizens of Apollo, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to place a prohibitive tax on intoxicating liquors, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the Delaware County Children's Aid Society, of Swarthmore, Pa., and a memorial of sundry citizens of Alderson, Pa., remonstrating against an increase in armaments, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a memorial of Local Union No. 179, International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees, of Williamsport, Pa., remonstrating against a tax on admission charges to theaters, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of the Pitman Manufacturing Co., of Laconia, N. H., praying for the imposition of a duty on dyestuffs, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BRANDEGEE presented petitions of the Aspinook Co.; the Ashland Cotton Co., of Jewett City; the Diamond Spring Line Co., of Stafford Springs; the Glazier Manufacturing Co., of South Glastonbury; the Pond Lily Co., of New Haven; the Pratt, Read & Co. and the Pratt, Read Player Action Co., of Deep River, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for the enactment of legislation to establish and maintain the manufacture of dyestuffs, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. NELSON presented the memorial of Thomas Gannett Holyoke, of St. Paul, Minn., remonstrating against an appropriation being made for the construction of a building for the Department of Justice, Washington, D. C., which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also presented a memorial of the Commercial Club, of St. Paul, Minn., remonstrating against a tax on gasoline, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of Washington Council, No. 1, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Minneapolis, Minn., praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a telegram in the nature of a memorial from Paris Gibson, of Great Falls, Mont., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to enlarge homesteads and for the leasing of public lands, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. ROBINSON presented a petition of the Board of Commerce of Little Rock, Ark., and a petition of the Cotton Exchange, of Memphis, Tenn., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate future deliveries of cotton, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. PITTMAN presented a petition of the Railroad Commission of the State of Nevada, praying for a readjustment of the compensation paid railroads for transporting the mails, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented a petition of the Peninsular Paper Co., of Ypsilanti, Mich., and a petition of the Michigan Bag & Paper Co., of Jackson, Mich., praying for the imposition of a

duty on dyestuffs, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of Lega Cittadina di Mutuo Soccorso, No. 1, of Laurium, Mich., and a petition of the Italo-American Federation, of Upper Peninsula, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. KENYON presented a petition of sundry citizens of Woodbine, Iowa, praying for national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Stars and Stripes Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, of Burlington, Iowa, praying for an increase in armaments, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of West Virginia, remonstrating against an increase in armaments, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. DILLINGHAM presented petitions of sundry citizens of Vermont, praying for the imposition of a duty on dyestuffs, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. McLEAN presented a petition of the Retail Druggists' Association of Bridgeport, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to fix a standard price for patented and trademarked articles, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Windsor Locks, Conn., praying for an appropriation for the improvement of the Connecticut River between Hartford and Holyoke, in that State, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of New Haven, of the Consumers' League, and of the Motherhood Club, of Hartford, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit interstate commerce in the products of child labor, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. THOMPSON, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 1793) granting to the State of Kansas title to certain lands in said State for use as a game preserve, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 62) thereon.

Mr. WILLIAMS, from the Committee on the Library, to which was referred the bill (S. 888) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to confer upon Marcus A. Jordan the life-saving medal of the first class, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 63) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 24) authorizing the Librarian of Congress to return to Williamsburg Lodge, No. 6, Ancient Free and Accepted Masons, of Virginia, the original manuscript of the record of the proceedings of said lodge, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 64) thereon.

#### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 3761) granting to the State of Utah the Fort Duchesne Reservation for its use as a branch agricultural college; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 3762) to amend section 2322 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to mineral locations; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 3763) granting an increase of pension to Jane McD. Johnston (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A bill (S. 3764) to consolidate certain forest lands in the Florida National Forest; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SHAFROTH:

A bill (S. 3765) granting an increase of pension to George Engleman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHEPPARD (for Mr. CULBERSON):

A bill (S. 3766) to provide for the erection of a public building at Dallas, Tex., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 3767) requiring all public-building bills to be submitted to the Secretary of the Treasury for investigation and report as to whether proposed buildings and sites are needed and the expenditure justified and as to the lowest cost at which buildings found necessary may be erected with economy and efficiency; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ROBINSON:

A bill (S. 3768) granting lands to Wade Pemberton and others, of Hot Springs Lodge, No. 62, Ancient Free and Accepted Masons, of Hot Springs, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 3769) to amend section 3 of an act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A bill (S. 3770) to amend the act to regulate commerce, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. ASHURST:

A bill (S. 3771) for the relief of Alfred Cluff, Orson Cluff, Henry E. Norton, William B. Ballard, Elijah Hancock, Susan R. Saline, Oscar Mann, Celia Thayne, William Cox, Theodore Farley, Adelaide Laxton, Clara L. Tenney, George M. Adams, Charlotte Jensen, and Sophia Huff; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 3772) for the relief of the estate of Facundo Gonzales (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 3773) to cancel the allotment of Davie Skootah on the Lummi Reservation, Wash., and reallocate the lands included therein; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 3774) to authorize the sale of lands allotted to Indians under the Moses Agreement of July 7, 1883; and

A bill (S. 3775) to establish the Mount Baker National Park, in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 3776) providing for the establishment of a radio station on Unga Island, Alaska; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 3777) for the relief of W. H. Presleigh (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 3778) granting a pension to Preston S. Atchison (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3779) granting an increase of pension to Thomas H. Rutter;

A bill (S. 3780) granting an increase of pension to Canrina R. H. Richey;

A bill (S. 3781) granting an increase of pension to Charles N. Schreiber;

A bill (S. 3782) granting an increase of pension to Abbie Sloggy;

A bill (S. 3783) granting an increase of pension to Theodore D. Swain;

A bill (S. 3784) granting an increase of pension to George M. Titus;

A bill (S. 3785) granting an increase of pension to John M. Turner;

A bill (S. 3786) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Welliver;

A bill (S. 3787) granting an increase of pension to Hulda L. Winter;

A bill (S. 3788) granting a pension to Rudolph Kals;

A bill (S. 3789) granting a pension to Lucina C. Hatch;

A bill (S. 3790) granting a pension to Elizabeth E. Harris;

A bill (S. 3791) granting a pension to James B. Gillick;

A bill (S. 3792) granting a pension to Charles H. Eyerman;

A bill (S. 3793) granting a pension to Willie J. Etheridge;

A bill (S. 3794) granting a pension to Fannie S. Douglass;

A bill (S. 3795) granting a pension to William S. Davidson;

A bill (S. 3796) granting a pension to Effie M. Crall;

A bill (S. 3797) granting a pension to Mabel F. Coen;

A bill (S. 3798) granting a pension to Catherine N. Burlingame;

A bill (S. 3799) granting a pension to Thomas Baxter;

A bill (S. 3800) granting a pension to William W. Batterton;

A bill (S. 3801) granting a pension to Charles A. Barthrop;

A bill (S. 3802) granting a pension to Edwin Ash;

A bill (S. 3803) granting a pension to Leander Alexander;

A bill (S. 3804) granting a pension to Lottie Short;

A bill (S. 3805) granting an increase of pension to Mahala Clemons;

A bill (S. 3806) granting an increase of pension to Susan J. Cantrell;

A bill (S. 3807) granting an increase of pension to George W. Boring;

A bill (S. 3808) granting an increase of pension to Caroline L. Ackley;

A bill (S. 3809) granting a pension to Matilda Weger;

A bill (S. 3810) granting an increase of pension to Pedro B. de G. Fernandez;



A bill (S. 3811) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Goodwin;

A bill (S. 3812) granting an increase of pension to Henry Harpham;

A bill (S. 3813) granting an increase of pension to Ida J. Morey;

A bill (S. 3814) granting an increase of pension to Eldridge Morse;

A bill (S. 3815) granting an increase of pension to William Mower;

A bill (S. 3816) granting an increase of pension to Anna L. Phillips;

A bill (S. 3817) granting an increase of pension to Emiles Pomeroy;

A bill (S. 3818) granting an increase of pension to Louis W. Pryor;

A bill (S. 3819) granting an increase of pension to Charlotte Randall;

A bill (S. 3820) granting an increase of pension to Augustus A. Rice;

A bill (S. 3821) granting an increase of pension to Ezra Rice;

A bill (S. 3822) granting a pension to Ottiwell M. Roberts;

A bill (S. 3823) granting a pension to Albert F. Pray;

A bill (S. 3824) granting a pension to Elisha Painter;

A bill (S. 3825) granting a pension to Sarah E. Muzy;

A bill (S. 3826) granting a pension to Penelope S. Miller;

A bill (S. 3827) granting a pension to Michael Maloney;

A bill (S. 3828) granting a pension to Fred T. Macomber;

A bill (S. 3829) granting a pension to Ella S. Kyes;

A bill (S. 3830) granting an increase of pension to Thomas McGooden;

A bill (S. 3831) granting an increase of pension to Mercy A. Martin;

A bill (S. 3832) granting an increase of pension to Lewis B. Hunt;

A bill (S. 3833) granting an increase of pension to Jens C. Jensen;

A bill (S. 3834) granting an increase of pension to Cassius M. Jones;

A bill (S. 3835) granting an increase of pension to John Little;

A bill (S. 3836) granting a pension to Delia E. Wall;

A bill (S. 3837) granting a pension to Isaac N. Troutman;

A bill (S. 3838) granting a pension to George A. Torchio;

A bill (S. 3839) granting a pension to Mary Standifer;

A bill (S. 3840) granting a pension to George W. Smith, alias George Smith;

A bill (S. 3841) granting a pension to Dollie E. A. Smith;

A bill (S. 3842) granting an increase of pension to Marion D. Egbert;

A bill (S. 3843) granting an increase of pension to William R. Donaldson;

A bill (S. 3844) granting an increase of pension to Joanna Dean; and

A bill (S. 3845) granting an increase of pension to Patrick J. Conway; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OLIVER:

A bill (S. 3846) granting a pension to Mary E. Lindsay (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3847) granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Runkle (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3848) granting an increase of pension to John Brown (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3849) granting an increase of pension to William Painter (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3850) granting an increase of pension to William P. McCartney;

A bill (S. 3851) granting an increase of pension to Archibald Haddan;

A bill (S. 3852) granting an increase of pension to John Stauffer;

A bill (S. 3853) granting a pension to Caroline Chambers;

A bill (S. 3854) granting an increase of pension to William Wright;

A bill (S. 3855) granting an increase of pension to David J. Braughler;

A bill (S. 3856) granting a pension to Mary M. Lose;

A bill (S. 3857) granting an increase of pension to Annie S. Aul; and

A bill (S. 3858) granting a pension to Amelia Walker; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CATRON:

A bill (S. 3859) granting an increase of pension to Teodora Antonia Baca de Martinez; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BROUSSARD:

A bill (S. 3860) for the relief of the Chettimanchi Band or Tribe of Indians of Louisiana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 3861) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act for the withdrawal from bond tax free of domestic alcohol when rendered unfit for beverage or liquid medicinal uses when mixed with suitable denaturing materials,'" approved March 2, 1907; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 3862) for the relief of the Rapides Building & Loan Association, of Alexandria, La.;

A bill (S. 3863) for the relief of the Shreveport Mutual Building Association;

A bill (S. 3864) for the relief of the Sixth District Building & Loan Association, of New Orleans, La.;

A bill (S. 3865) for the relief of the Fidelity Homestead Association, of New Orleans, La.;

A bill (S. 3866) for the relief of the Union Homestead Association, of New Orleans, La.;

A bill (S. 3867) for the relief of the Iberia Building Association, of New Iberia, La.; and

A bill (S. 3868) for the relief of the Teutonia Loan & Building Co., of New Orleans, La.; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 3869) granting a pension to Marcelle M. Muller, Anthony N. Muller, jr., and Maud Muller; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WALSH:

A bill (S. 3870) to validate the Indian allotment application of Anna Campbell Valentine; and

A bill (S. 3871) to validate the homestead application of Edith A. Purdy (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. PHELAN:

A bill (S. 3872) for the relief of John Horgan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BORAH:

A bill (S. 3873) to authorize the counties of Minidoka and Cassia, State of Idaho, to construct a bridge across Snake River; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 3874) granting an increase of pension to Peleg N. Carson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WORKS:

A bill (S. 3875) granting a pension to Ione I. Bell (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 3876) for the relief of George H. Rarey; and

A bill (S. 3877) for the relief of William Fulton Hedges (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 3878) granting a pension to Michael Smyth (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3879) granting an increase of pension to Milton M. Jones (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3880) granting an increase of pension to Solomon Keffer (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3881) granting an increase of pension to Mandana C. Thorp (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DILLINGHAM:

A bill (S. 3882) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Thompson (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3883) granting a pension to Annie Bonville (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3884) granting a pension to John Washburn (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURLEIGH:

A bill (S. 3885) granting an increase of pension to Fitch Lockwood;

A bill (S. 3886) granting an increase of pension to Lucy R. Hall;

A bill (S. 3887) granting an increase of pension to Isaiah W. Cross;

A bill (S. 3888) granting a pension to Elias Lyon;

A bill (S. 3889) granting an increase of pension to Lula S. Knight Bigelow; and

A bill (S. 3890) granting an increase of pension to Robert Whitehead; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LEA of Tennessee:

A bill (S. 3891) granting a pension to G. W. Leathers;

A bill (S. 3892) granting an increase of pension to Harry Colpus; and

A bill (S. 3893) granting a pension to Robert M. Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McLEAN:

A bill (S. 3894) for the relief of Henry E. Williams (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LANE:

A bill (S. 3895) for the relief of the Portland Iron Works; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MYERS:

A bill (S. 3896) granting an increase of pension to Hettie Fletcher; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CLAPP:

A bill (S. 3897) to authorize the purchase of the manuscript of the Legislative History of the Army of the United States and to make appropriation therefor (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 3898) granting an increase of pension to Elmer C. Stiles, alias Charles White; and

A bill (S. 3899) granting a pension to Josef Messany; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD:

A bill (S. 3900) to authorize the sale and disposal of an island in the Coosa River, in the State of Alabama; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 3901) for the relief of Lieuts. E. E. Bennett, W. N. Porter, and W. W. Hicks; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHERMAN:

A bill (S. 3902) granting a pension to James T. Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

A bill (S. 3903) granting an increase of pension to Elie Jones Quinby; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota:

A bill (S. 3904) conferring upon tribes or bands of Indians the right of nomination and election of their agents or superintendents, to encourage them to interest themselves in their own affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SHIVELY:

A bill (S. 3905) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Hanson (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3906) granting an increase of pension to Hugh Harbinson; and

A bill (S. 3907) granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Mayo; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS:

A bill (S. 3908) granting a pension to Jennie Perry (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. O'GORMAN:

A bill (S. 3909) granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Dawson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (by request):

A bill (S. 3910) for the relief of Capt. Thomas R. Clark; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NORRIS:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 85) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States for the election of President and Vice President by direct vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### THE GOVERNMENT OF THE PHILIPPINES.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, I offer the following amendment to S. 381, the so-called Philippine government bill, and ask that it may be printed and also printed in the RECORD. I will say, if permitted to do so, that I offer it as a substitute for all the amendments I have heretofore offered on this subject. I have revised it somewhat and amplified it slightly. I think it now presents the views of those who think something should be done in the matter at this time.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator have any objection to having it read at this time?

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Not the slightest. I shall be very glad to include in my request that it shall be read at the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the amendment.

The amendment was read and ordered to be printed, as follows:

SEC. —. The President is hereby authorized and directed to withdraw and surrender all right of possession, supervision, jurisdiction, control, or sovereignty now existing and exercised by the United States in and over the territory and people of the Philippines, and he shall on behalf of the United States fully recognize the independence of the said Philippines as a separate and self-governing nation and acknowledge the authority and control over the same of the government instituted by the people thereof. This transfer of possession, sovereignty, and governmental control shall be completed and become absolute not less than two years nor more than four years from the date of the approval of this act, under the terms and in the manner hereinafter

prescribed: *Provided*, That if the President, at the expiration of the said period of four years, shall find that the condition of the internal or external affairs of said Philippines in respect to the stability or efficiency of the proposed government thereof is such as to warrant him in so doing, he is hereby further authorized, by proclamation duly made and published, to extend the said time to and including the date of the final adjournment of the session of Congress which shall convene next after the date of the expiration of the said period of four years, and thus afford the Congress an opportunity in its discretion to further consider the situation in the said Philippines; but any such extension of time by the President shall not otherwise suspend or nullify the operative force of this act, unless the Congress shall hereafter so direct. For the purpose of a complete and prompt compliance with this direction, the President is hereby invested with full power and authority to make such orders and regulations and to enter into such negotiations with the authorities of said Philippines or others as may be necessary to finally settle and adjust all property rights and other relations as between the United States and the said Philippines, and to cause to be acknowledged, respected, and safeguarded all of the personal and property rights of citizens or corporations of the United States resident or engaged in business in said Philippines or having property interests therein. In any such settlement or adjustment so made in respect to the rights and property of the United States as against the said Philippines the President shall reserve or acquire such lands and rights and privileges appurtenant thereto as may, in his judgment, be required by the United States for naval bases and coaling stations within the territory of said Philippines.

Immediately upon the passage of the act, the President shall invite the cooperation of the principal nations interested in the affairs of that part of the world in which the Philippines are located, in the form of a treaty or other character of binding agreement, whereby the cooperating nations shall mutually pledge themselves to recognize and respect the sovereignty and independence of the said Philippines, and also to mutually obligate themselves, equally and not one primarily nor to any greater extent than another, to maintain as against external force the sovereignty of said Philippines. If any of the nations so invited to join the United States in such undertaking shall decline to do so, then the President shall include as parties to such convention or agreement such nations as may be willing to join therein and to assume such obligations; and if none are willing to so unite therein, then the President is authorized to give such guaranty on behalf of the United States alone for the period of five years from and after the expiration of said period of four years, or any extension thereof, and pending the existence of such separate guaranty by the United States, the United States shall be entitled to retain and exercise such control and supervision in the said Philippines as may be necessary to enforce order therein and to avoid external complications.

#### STOCK-RAISING HOMESTEADS.

Mr. BORAH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1053) to provide for stock-raising homesteads, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

#### MUNITIONS OF WAR.

Mr. ROBINSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. —) to provide a tax on munitions of war manufactured in the United States and to amend the act of Congress approved October 22, 1914, entitled "An act to increase the internal revenue, and for other purposes," which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

#### PUBLIC PRINTING AND BINDING.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1107) to amend, revise, and codify the laws relating to public printing and binding and distribution of Government publications, which was referred to the Committee on Printing and ordered to be printed.

#### THE JUDICIAL CODE.

Mr. FLETCHER submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1412) further to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

Mr. CURTIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1412) further to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

#### AMENDMENTS TO URGENT DEFICIENCY BILL.

Mr. TILLMAN submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$1,250 for rental of additional quarters in the District of Columbia for the Navy Department during the remainder of the fiscal year 1916, intended to be proposed by him to the urgent deficiency appropriation bill (H. R. 9416), which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. GALLINGER submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$50,000 to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to meet the emergency caused by the continuous spread of the white pine blister, rust, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the urgent deficiency appropriation bill (H. R. 9416), which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. ROBINSON submitted an amendment proposing to set aside from the several appropriations for protection, improvement, and management, etc., of the various national parks, including the Hot Springs Reservation, such sum or sums as



the Secretary of the Interior may deem necessary to be expended in the employment of competent persons in the District of Columbia and in the field, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the urgent deficiency appropriation bill (H. R. 9416), which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

#### THE FRIGATE "CONSTITUTION."

Mr. GALLINGER. I submit a resolution, for which I ask present consideration.

The resolution (S. Res. 76) was read, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby directed to communicate to the Senate all facts bearing on the present condition of the frigate *Constitution*, now lying in the Charles River, Boston, and also an estimate of the amount of money that will be required to put the frigate in a condition of good repair, with a view of retaining the vessel as a historic relic of the early days of the American Navy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Hampshire asks for the present consideration of the resolution. Is there objection?

Mr. STONE. Let it go over until to-morrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will go over.

#### EMPLOYMENT OF ASSISTANT CLERK.

Mr. LEA of Tennessee submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 77), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

*Resolved*, That the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate be, and it is hereby, authorized to employ an additional assistant clerk at \$1,200 per annum, to be paid from "miscellaneous items" of the contingent fund of the Senate until otherwise provided by law.

#### EMPLOYMENT OF STENOGRAPHER.

Mr. O'GORMAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 78), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Inter-oceanic Canals be authorized to employ a stenographer temporarily and that the said stenographer be paid at the rate of \$50 per month for each day of such employment, not exceeding four months, and that such services be paid for out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

#### SELF-GOVERNMENT IN THE TROPICS.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I send to the desk a pamphlet entitled "Self-Government in the Tropics," by Samuel L. Parrish, and request that it be referred to the Committee on Printing, with a view to the printing of it as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be so referred.

#### NATIONAL PROHIBITION (S. DOC. NO. 250).

Mr. CHILTON. I ask that there be printed as a document certain extracts from reports of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor in the Forty-ninth, Fiftieth, and Fifty-first Congresses, favorably recommending the passage of resolutions for the submission of the question of national constitutional prohibition to the several States of the Union, together with a letter from ex-Senator Henry W. Blair, of New Hampshire, to Hon. MORRIS SHEPPARD, United States Senator from Texas, relating thereto. I have had an estimate made and find that it will cost about \$50.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CHILTON. I ask that 2,000 additional copies of the document be printed for the use of the Senate document room.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 9416. An act making appropriations to supply further urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and prior years, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

#### LANDS IN NEVADA.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning business is closed. The calendar under Rule VIII is in order.

The bill (S. 2520) granting to the State of Nevada 7,000,000 acres of land in said State for the use and benefit of the public schools of Nevada and the State university of the State of Nevada was announced as first in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that bill go over, Mr. President.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. I have asked that the bill go over this morning.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, the bill has been at the head of the calendar for a month. It is a simple measure. I submit that it is not fair for the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] to constantly object to its consideration. The bill has been attacked through the newspapers of this town, and that attack

is having its effect. Nearly every western Senator has been attacked on account of the bill, and bills similar to it. I do not think it fair to western Senators to permit this attack to go on as it has done, and not to be answered at this time. So I ask the Senator from Utah, for that reason, to allow the bill to be taken up at this time.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I have previously stated to the Senator from Nevada that the Senator from New Mexico desires to speak on the bill, and that Senator is now absent from the Chamber. I therefore ask that the bill go over until the Senator from New Mexico shall be present.

Mr. PITTMAN. Do I understand the Senator from New Mexico to whom the Senator from Utah refers to be Senator FALL?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. PITTMAN. And that that Senator is now sick?

Mr. SMOOT. I do not know whether or not the Senator is sick, but he is not now in the Chamber.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, after the bill has been on the calendar for a month, and we have tried to get it considered and disposed of, after it has been a dozen times passed over at the request of the Senator from Utah, it seems to me that the Senator from New Mexico has had sufficient opportunity to be present and to discuss the bill if he desires to do so.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I told the Senator from Nevada that I should object to the consideration of the bill, and I have done so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Being objected to, the bill goes over.

#### BILLS PASSED OVER.

The bill (S. 1053) to provide for stock-raising homesteads, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. PITTMAN. I object to the consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill goes over.

The bill (S. 1062) relating to the duties of registers of United States land offices and the publication in newspapers of official land-office notices was announced as next in order.

Mr. PITTMAN. I object to the consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill goes over.

The bill (S. 381) to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands, and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands, was announced as next in order.

Mr. PITTMAN. I object to the consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill goes over.

The bill (S. 706) to amend section 260 of an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911, was announced as next in order.

Mr. PITTMAN. I object to the consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill goes over.

The bill (S. 609) to aid in the erection of a monument to Pocahontas at Jamestown, Va., was announced as next in order.

Mr. PITTMAN. I object to the consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill goes over.

The bill (S. 611) for the erection of a monument to the memory of Matthew Fontaine Maury, of Virginia, was announced as next in order.

Mr. PITTMAN. I object to the consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill goes over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States conferring upon women the right of suffrage was announced as next in order.

Mr. PITTMAN. I object to the consideration of the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Being objected to, the joint resolution goes over.

The bill (S. 707) for the relief of Beverly E. Whitehead was announced as next in order.

Mr. PITTMAN. I object to the consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill goes over.

The bill (S. 3331) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of dams across navigable waters," approved June 21, 1906, as amended by the act approved June 23, 1910, and to provide for the improvement and development of waterways for the uses of interstate and foreign commerce was announced as next in order.

Mr. PITTMAN. I object to the consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill goes over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 72) to provide for holding the San Antonio Bicentennial Exposition in 1918 was announced as next in order.

Mr. PITTMAN. I object to the consideration of the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution goes over.

The bill (S. 2406) to amend section 162 of the act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary, approved March 3, 1911, was announced as next in order.

Mr. PITTMAN. I object to the consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill goes over.

#### PENSIONS AND INCREASE OF PENSIONS.

The bill (S. 3518) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War, and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, was announced as next in order.

Mr. PITTMAN. I object to the consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill goes over.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill just announced on the calendar, which is a pension bill, notwithstanding the objection of the Senator from Nevada.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from New Hampshire to proceed to the consideration of the bill notwithstanding the objection.

Mr. PITTMAN. I move as a substitute for that motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration—

Mr. GALLINGER. The motion is not in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question first comes on the motion of the Senator from New Hampshire to proceed to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. PITTMAN. I raise a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PITTMAN. My point of order is that a motion of this kind is not in order until the hour of 1 o'clock has arrived, and before the calendar has been thoroughly called.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order is overruled. It is a rule of the Senate that at the conclusion of morning business, or if morning business has not been concluded by the hour of 1 o'clock, a motion may be made to take up any bill on the calendar; and, once having been made, a motion to substitute some other bill is not in order. The motion to proceed to the consideration of a bill must first be passed on. The question now, therefore, is—

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, in order that I may understand what the ruling of the Chair is, I desire to ask, does the Chair rule that before 1 o'clock, if morning business is closed, a motion to proceed to the consideration of a bill on the calendar can be made?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does so rule.

Mr. GALLINGER. There is no doubt about it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair was forced to that conclusion by the Senator from Utah at the last session of Congress on a former ruling of the Chair.

Mr. GALLINGER. Question!

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, whether the Senate will proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 3518. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I ask that the title of the bill be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the bill by title.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 3518) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War, and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLAPP (when his name was called). In the absence of my general pair, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea."

Mr. STERLING (when the name of Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota was called). I announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. JOHNSON] on account of illness.

Mr. OVERMAN (when his name was called). In the absence of my general pair, the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN], I withhold my vote.

Mr. TOWNSEND (when the name of Mr. SMITH of Michigan was called). The senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] is absent, but is paired with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. I desire this announcement to stand for all votes to-day.

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANDELL] and vote "nay."

Mr. TILLMAN (when his name was called). In the absence of my general pair, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF], I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CHILTON. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. GOFF] is absent on account of illness, as is also the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]. They are both paired.

Mr. COLT. In the absence of my general pair, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY], I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. DILLINGHAM (after having voted in the affirmative). I have already voted, but I have ascertained that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH], with whom I have a general pair, is absent. I therefore transfer my pair to the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BRADY] and will allow my vote to stand.

Mr. OLIVER. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. PENROSE] is necessarily absent. He is paired with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]. If he were present and at liberty to vote, my colleague would vote "yea." I make this announcement for the day.

Mr. GRONNA. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. McCUMBER] is necessarily absent and that he is paired with the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS]. If my colleague were present and at liberty to vote, he would vote "yea."

Mr. CATRON (after having voted in the affirmative). I am paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. KERN. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. SHIVELY], who is paired with the Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH].

I also desire to announce the unavoidable absence of the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], who is paired with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE].

Mr. BURLEIGH. I am paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. SHIVELY]. I understand that if he were present he would vote as I am about to vote. I will therefore take the liberty of voting. I vote "yea."

Mr. REED. I am paired with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] and vote "yea."

Mr. STONE. I announce the unavoidable absence of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY] on account of illness. He is paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT].

The result was announced—yeas 56, nays 12, as follows:

#### YEAS—56.

Ashurst	Gallinger	Lippitt	Shafroth
Borah	Gronna	Lodge	Shields
Brandeggee	Harding	McLean	Smith, Ariz.
Burleigh	Hitchcock	Martine, N. J.	Smoot
Catron	Hollis	Nelson	Sterling
Chamberlain	Hughes	Norris	Stone
Chilton	James	O'Gorman	Sutherland
Clark, Wyo.	Johnson, Me.	Oliver	Thompson
Clarke, Ark.	Jones	Page	Townsend
Cummins	Kenyon	Phelan	Underwood
Curtis	Kern	Pittman	Wadsworth
Dillingham	La Follette	Polindexter	Walsh
du Pont	Lane	Pomerene	Weeks
Fall	Lea, Tenn.	Reed	Works

#### NAYS—12.

Bankhead	Hardwick	Robinson	Smith, S. C.
Bryan	Husting	Sheppard	Thomas
Fletcher	Myers	Smith, Ga.	Vardaman

#### NOT VOTING—28.

Beckham	Gore	Overman	Simmons
Brady	Johnson, S. Dak.	Owen	Smith, Md.
Broussard	Lee, Md.	Penrose	Smith, Mich.
Clapp	Lewis	Ransdell	Swanson
Colt	McCumber	Saulsbury	Tillman
Culberson	Martin, Va.	Sherman	Warren
Goff	Newlands	Shively	Williams

So Mr. GALLINGER's motion was agreed to; and the Senate as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3518) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors. It proposes to place upon the pension roll, at the rate per month therein specified, the following-named persons:

George Jagers, late of Company F, Seventeenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Barnet Hauver, late of Company B, Seventy-second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

David Phillips, alias Charles Gray, late of U. S. S. *Key West*, *Great Western*, and *Naumkeag*, United States Navy, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John R. Thompson, late of Company H, One hundred and forty-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.



Frederick Schnetzer, late of Company G, One hundred and twenty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

James H. Goldsborough, late of Company B, One hundred and fifty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Emma F. Webster, widow of George A. Webster, late of Company H, Tenth Regiment, and Company E, Sixth Regiment, New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

John A. Morris, late captain and assistant quartermaster, United States Volunteers, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Spencer J. Dyer, late of Company B, Third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and second lieutenant Company K, Fifth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Heavy Artillery, \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Jane E. Bloss, widow of George E. Bloss, late of Company H, Fiftieth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving and \$2 per month additional on account of the minor child of George E. Bloss until she reaches the age of 16 years.

Cyrus Spooner, late of Company K, Sixth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Dellias W. Compton, late of Company F, Thirty-eighth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Catherine Scheibel, widow of William Scheibel, late of Company M, First Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Cavalry, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Charlotte J. Smith, widow of Frederick L. Smith, late of Company F, Twenty-third Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Lydia A. Smith, widow of Augustus E. Smith, late of Company E, First Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Heavy Artillery, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Daniel L. Tallcott, late of Company G, Twenty-fifth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Aurelia M. Todd, widow of Samuel D. Todd, late of Company D, Sixteenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Emma M. Bowman, widow of Edward Bowman, late of Company E, Ninth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Susie S. Flanders, widow of George J. Flanders, late of Company D, Eighteenth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Josiah P. Hackett, late of Company A, Seventeenth Regiment United States Infantry, \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Andrew Jewell, late of Company A, Eighteenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William J. Young, late of Company K, Thirty-sixth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Rebecca Hutton, widow of Michael Hutton, late of Company C, Twelfth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and Company D, Two hundred and second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Peter M. Miller, late of Company E, Forty-fifth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Thomas A. Carpenter, late of Company H, Twelfth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mary Bresnahan, widow of John Bresnahan, late of Company F, Tenth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, \$12 per month.

Josiah A. Dadmun, late musician, Third Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Irving W. Coombs, late of Company H, Fifteenth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Samuel Hodgkins, late of Company C, Fifteenth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Theophile A. Dauphin, late of Company K, Eighty-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John W. Wooley, alias John Wilson, late of Company F, Third Battalion, Fifteenth Regiment United States Infantry, \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William H. Steel, late of Company D, First Regiment Delaware Volunteer Cavalry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Frederick Ickley, late of Company D, Fourteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Caroline E. Beck, widow of George A. Beck, late of Company H, Thirteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Nicholas A. Bovee, late of Company E, Seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Matilda J. Hampton, widow of John Hampton, late of Company H, First Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Harvey E. Derrin, late unassigned, Fourteenth Regiment, and Company L, Sixth Regiment, New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Alberton H. Town, late of Company G, Ninety-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Ruby L. Knapp, helpless and dependent child of William B. Knapp, late of Company D, Twenty-fourth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and hospital steward, United States Army, \$12 per month.

Terance McGrath, late of U. S. S. *Ohio*, *Lockwood*, and *Hetzel*, United States Navy, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Bridget Prickett, widow of Milton Prickett, late of Company A, First Regiment Oregon Volunteer Cavalry, \$12 per month.

William Shaw, late of Company K, Thirtieth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Horace H. Lockwood, late of Company D, Second Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and First Independent Company, Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, \$21 per month.

George W. Sargent, late of Company F, Twenty-seventh Regiment, and Company F, Twelfth Regiment, Iowa Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mary B. Yerington, former widow of Almon Yerington, late of Company E, Sixth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, \$12 per month.

Matilda Davis, widow of William H. Davis, late of Company D, Fifth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Henry Wagoner, late of Company D, Seventy-seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Rufus S. Maxwell, late of Company F, Nineteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Herbert M. Starbird, late of Company M, First Regiment District of Columbia Volunteer Cavalry, and Company D, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Cavalry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Abbie F. Dyer, widow of Ambrose S. Dyer, late first lieutenant Company H, Fifth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Henry J. McFadden, late second lieutenant Company D, Forty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Harris B. Hubbell, late of Company D, First Regiment Illinois Volunteer Light Artillery, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Orin W. Goodale, late of Company A, First Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Eliza M. Watkins, widow of Joseph H. Watkins, late of Company K, One hundred and twenty-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, \$24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Essie Watkins, helpless and dependent child of said Joseph H. Watkins, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Eliza M. Watkins the name of the said Essie Watkins shall be placed on the pension roll at \$12 per month from and after the date of death of said Eliza M. Watkins.

William Howard, late of Company B, One hundred and second Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Isaac H. Bodenhamer, late of Company A, Seventy-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Aliza A. Gordon, widow of Eli P. Gordon, late of Company E, Fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, \$12 per month.

Americus V. Larrance, late of Company G, One hundred and twenty-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Harriet A. Turnbull, widow of John M. Turnbull, late first lieutenant Company C, Thirty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and former widow of Samuel R. Edwards, late of Company D, One hundred and thirty-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, \$20 per month.

Emma D. Phelps, widow of George W. Phelps, late of Company H, Sixtieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Franklin H. Gillett, late of Company A, First Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Heavy Artillery, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

George W. Halsey, late of Company D, One hundred and thirtieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Lavina Hunter, widow of William F. Hunter, late of Company A, Ninety-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Abraham Jones, late of Company I, Sixth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William Kenyon, late of Company I, Thirteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Ebenezer C. Lafollett, late of Company F, One hundred and fortieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Catharine Mayer, widow of Nikolas Mayer, late of Company I, One hundred and forty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Clara Mayer, helpless and dependent child of said Nikolas Mayer, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Catharine Mayer the name of the said Clara Mayer shall be placed on the pension roll at \$12 per month from and after the date of death of said Catharine Mayer.

George Ringle, late of Company K, Twenty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Alfred P. Williams, late of Company G, Fifty-ninth Regiment, and Company F, Sixty-sixth Regiment, Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

George E. Fleming, late of Company D, Sixty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Marion Clemans, late of Company A, Twenty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Susan M. Lysinger, widow of Joseph H. Lysinger, late of United States Navy, \$12 per month.

George W. Aldrich, late of Company A, Fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

August Baker, late of Company K, One hundred and twenty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Samuel Dunham, late of Company G, Thirty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William C. Fickas, late of Company L, Second Regiment Missouri Volunteer Light Artillery, \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Hacker Davis, late of Company I, Thirty-first Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Amelia Hubbard, widow of Lucius F. Hubbard, late colonel Fifth Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and brevet brigadier general United States Volunteers, \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

James Wilson, late of Company L, Thirteenth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William B. Morrell, late of Company A, Thirteenth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Richard H. McWhorter, late first lieutenant Company C, Thirteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry; \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

George W. Hill, late of the U. S. ram *Queen of the West*, United States Navy, \$21.50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

George Bond, late of Company C, Thirteenth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Infantry, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

George W. Adams, late of Company B, Twenty-second Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Maria E. Bowers, widow of Ira M. Bowers, late second lieutenant Company H, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Heavy Artillery, \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Charles P. De Forest, late of Company A, Tenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Henry H. Geer, late of Company B, Eighteenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Margaret Semple, widow of James W. Semple, late of Company A, Eighteenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Henry H. Klock, late first lieutenant and adjutant Ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

May Bell Anderson, widow of Thomas J. Anderson, late first lieutenant and aide-de-camp Gen. Lane's staff, United States Volunteers, and major and assistant adjutant general, United States Volunteers, \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Eugene B. Fisher, late of Company D, Twenty-third Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

James S. Ames, late of Company G, Eighty-seventh Regiment, and Company G, Forty-second Regiment, Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Henry J. Mullins, late of Company A, Twenty-fourth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Hannah R. Linton, widow of James D. Linton, late of Company D, One hundred and twenty-fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and former widow of Benjamin Linton, late of Company F, Fourth Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Sarah E. Hanes, widow of John Hanes, late of Company D, Twenty-fifth Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, \$24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Joseph H. Hanes, helpless and dependent child of said John Hanes, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Sarah E. Hanes the name of the said Joseph H. Hanes shall be placed on the pension roll at \$12 per month from and after the date of death of said Sarah E. Hanes.

Nancy C. Fouts, widow of William P. Fouts, late of Company B, Fifth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and former widow of Norman J. Painter, late of Company B, First Regiment Michigan Engineers and Mechanics, \$12 per month.

Mary Norton, helpless and dependent child of Patrick Norton, late of Company A, Forty-second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, \$12 per month.

Napoleon Tulip, late of Company I, Seventeenth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Ann L. Elliott, former widow of Jesse Elliott, late of Company H, Thirteenth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Infantry, \$12 per month.

Martha C. Igo, widow of Daniel Igo, late of Company E, Eleventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and first lieutenant Company I, Two hundred and eleventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Jesse Thompson, late of Company E, Thirteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Bella Curry, widow of Amos P. Curry, late captain Company B, Tenth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Susan Robinson, widow of Squire Robinson, late of Company G, Seventy-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and



former widow of Robert G. Bloomfield, late of Company K, Thirtieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Caroline J. Cromwell, widow of Charles W. Cromwell, late first lieutenant Company H, First Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Mounted Rangers, \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Gideon Mason, late of Company C, Ninety-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and One hundred and twenty-sixth Company, Second Battalion Veteran Reserve Corps, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Gabriel Anderson, alias Gabriel Oleson, late of Company D, Thirty-eighth Regiment, and Company H, Thirty-fourth Regiment, Iowa Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Joseph Lappier, late of Company D, Second Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Samuel M. Terry, late of Troops D and K, Second Regiment United States Cavalry, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Louisa Galtner, widow of George Galtner, late of Company H, Sixth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

John Wiebel, late of Company F, Third Regiment Potomac Home Brigade, Maryland Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Elander R. Grant, late of Company D, Second Regiment Maine Volunteer Cavalry, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Joseph Wentworth, late of U. S. S. *Ohio*, *Albatross*, and *Princeton*, United States Navy, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Edward A. Savage, late of Company E, One hundred and twenty-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William O. Freeman, late of U. S. S. *Sabine*, *Ohio*, and *Casco*, United States Navy, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Zadoc McFarland, alias Samuel G. West, late of Company G, Eighth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Robert R. Ferris, late of Company G, One hundred and seventy-ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Sarah E. Davis, widow of Benjamin F. Davis, late of Companies I and A, Fourteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, \$12 per month.

John Kemmer, late of Company K, Forty-eighth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mary C. Estes, widow of Albert H. Estes, late captain Company E, Tenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

George Osten, late leader of band, Ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Joseph L. Buckley, late of Company E, First Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Christopher C. Blake, late of Company G, Second Regiment United States Volunteer Sharpshooters, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

William Wilkins, late of Company D, Twelfth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

True W. Lovering, late of Company F, Thirteenth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Eli W. Adams, late of Company A, Ninety-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Lydia F. Goodaker, widow of Samuel C. Goodaker, late of Company M, Second Regiment California Volunteer Cavalry, \$12 per month.

Mary I. Fawcett, widow of Thomas Fawcett, late of the United States Navy, \$12 per month.

Thomas B. Carey, late of Company H, Sixteenth Regiment, and Company F, Seventieth Regiment, Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Jacob Conrad, late of Company E, Thirtieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Rose A. Mooney, now Reed, former widow of Julius C. Mooney, late of Company K, One hundred and fifty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, \$12 per month.

Sallie A. Hawkes, widow of Erastus L. Hawkes, late of Company F, One hundred and twenty-first Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and major, Tenth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine. Mr. President, on page 14 I move to strike out lines 11, 12, 13, and 14, the pensioner having died.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 14 it is proposed to strike out lines 11, 12, 13, and 14, in the following words:

The name of Marion Clemans, late of Company A, Twenty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 60) creating a joint subcommittee from the membership of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce and the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate the conditions relating to interstate and foreign commerce, and the necessity of further legislation relating thereto, and defining the powers and duties of such subcommittee, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that the joint resolution go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be passed over.

#### FEDERAL JUDGES.

The resolution (S. Res. 66) directing the Judiciary Committee of the Senate to make inquiry and report the number of Federal judges now holding office who are unable to discharge substantially the duties of a judge, etc., was next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, has Senate joint resolution 60 been called?

Mr. LODGE. Yes; and it was passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has been passed over.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Would it be in order for me to move to take up the joint resolution at this time?

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, what action was taken on the resolution just read?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair was about to put the question when interrupted by the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I was on the floor, but did not observe that the joint resolution had been passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. So soon as this resolution is disposed of it will be in order for any Senator to make a motion to take up any bill on the calendar. The question is on agreeing to Senate resolution 66.

The resolution was agreed to.

#### INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order of Business No. 33, being Senate joint resolution 60.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me? I wish to say that I hope he will not make that motion this morning. I desire to look at the resolution, and I have not the time, of course, to do so now.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I called up the joint resolution the other day, and was told that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] wished to offer an amendment; and I consented to have the matter go over until he could have an opportunity to do so. It is important that the resolution should be considered. I can not tell at what stage other business may intervene to prevent its consideration, and I beg the Senator not to insist upon a further postponement. I think I have shown sufficient consideration for those who wished to address themselves to the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nevada withdraw his motion.

Mr. NEWLANDS. No; I must press my motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question, then, is on the motion of the Senator from Nevada. [Putting the question.] By the sound the ayes seem to have it.

Mr. NORRIS. I ask for a division.

The VICE PRESIDENT. All in favor of proceeding to the consideration of Senate joint resolution No. 60 will rise. [A

pause.] All opposed will rise. [A pause.] The ayes have it, and the Chair lays the joint resolution before the Senate.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 60) creating a joint subcommittee from the membership of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce and the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate the conditions relating to interstate and foreign commerce and the necessity of further legislation relating thereto, and defining the powers and duties of such subcommittee.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gore	McLean	Smith, Ariz.
Bankhead	Gronna	Martin, Va.	Smith, Ga.
Beckham	Harding	Martine, N. J.	Smith, S. C.
Borah	Hitchcock	Myers	Smoot
Brandegee	Hollis	Nelson	Sterling
Broussard	Hughes	Newlands	Stone
Bryan	Husting	Norris	Sutherland
Cañon	James	O'Gorman	Swanson
Chamberlain	Johnson, Me.	Oliver	Thomas
Chilton	Johnson, S. Dak.	Page	Thompson
Clapp	Jones	Phelan	Tillman
Clark, Wyo.	Kenyon	Pittman	Townsend
Colt	Kern	Poinexter	Underwood
Cummins	La Follette	Reed	Vardaman
Curtis	Lane	Robinson	Wadsworth
Dillingham	Lea, Tenn.	Shafroth	Weeks
du Pont	Lee, Md.	Sheppard	Williams
Fletcher	Lippitt	Sherman	Works
Gallinger	Lodge	Shields	

Mr. CHILTON. My colleague [Mr. Goff] is absent on account of illness. He is paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Tillman].

Mr. BORAH. I desire to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. Brady] on account of illness. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-five Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The joint resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the joint resolution, as follows:

Whereas a number of bills are now pending in Congress, having for their object the further regulation of carriers engaged in interstate commerce; and

Whereas the Interstate Commerce Commission has, from time to time, made recommendations to Congress in relation to the general subject of regulation, some of which are now under consideration but have not yet been acted on; and

Whereas a system of governmental regulation of interstate commerce has now been in effect for 28 years, during which period the extent and powers of regulation have been, from time to time, varied and enlarged, and there has thus been accumulated valuable experience for the guidance of Congress in the premises; and

Whereas the growth of interstate commerce and the enlargement of the powers and duties of regulation have so increased the exactions on the Interstate Commerce Commission as to necessitate, in the public interest, the consideration of the best method of dealing with the situation and of expediting the public business; and

Whereas adequate and well-managed transportation facilities constitute a prime necessity of business prosperity and are a common interest of all the people, and in order to afford these facilities and to enlarge them as the needs of commerce increase the credit of the carriers and proper regulation of their operations are matters of fundamental public concern; and

Whereas as a basis for any further legislation that may be undertaken by Congress in this regard the whole subject of governmental regulation should be deliberately and thoroughly studied in the light of the experience and suggestions of the Interstate Commerce Commission, of the carriers, of the shippers, and of the general public, with a view to adequately safeguarding the interests of the public, securing the establishment and maintenance of transportation facilities adequate to the needs of a growing and expanding commerce, and assuring to private owners and the investing public just consideration and protection of their legitimate rights of property:

Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved, etc.,* That the Interstate Commerce Committee of the Senate and the Committee of the House of Representatives on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, through a joint subcommittee to consist of five Senators and five Representatives, who shall be selected by said committees, respectively, be, and they hereby are, appointed to investigate and report upon the subject of the regulation of interstate and foreign commerce, with authority to sit during the recess of Congress and with power to summon witnesses, to appoint necessary experts, clerks, and stenographers, and to do whatever is necessary for a full and comprehensive examination and study of the subject and report to Congress on or before the third Monday in December next; that a sum sufficient to carry out the purposes of this resolution and to pay the necessary expenses of the subcommittee and its members is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated. Said appropriation shall be immediately available and shall be paid out on the audit and order of the chairman or acting chairman of said subcommittee, which audit and order shall be conclusive and binding upon all departments as to the correctness of the accounts of such subcommittee.

The joint resolution had been reported from the Committee on Interstate Commerce with an amendment as follows:

On page 3, lines 5 and 6, strike out the words "and report upon the subject of the regulation of interstate and foreign commerce" and insert "the subject of the Government control

and regulation of interstate and foreign transportation, the efficiency of the existing system in protecting the rights of shippers and carriers and in promoting the public interest, the incorporation or control of the incorporation of carriers, and all proposed changes in the organization of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the act to regulate commerce."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement regarding this joint resolution.

The purpose of the resolution is to make an exhaustive inquiry regarding interstate and foreign transportation, similar to the inquiry made by the National Monetary Commission regarding finance and banking. The resolution, however, does not provide for a commission, but for a subcommittee of the Interstate Commerce Committees of the House and the Senate—5 Members from each; 10 in all.

Numerous bills have been introduced in both Houses looking to the regulation of railway securities, the increase in the membership and the division into branches or departments of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the national incorporation of great interstate railway systems, the relations between rail and water carriers, both river and ocean. The proposals were so numerous and varied, and the difference of opinion regarding them so great, that it was thought the coordinating of the committees of the Senate and House having jurisdiction of interstate transportation would be instrumental in focusing the attention of Congress upon definite measures which would be framed after full hearing and discussion. Such measures would then go to the committees themselves for consideration and report to the respective bodies. The President had favored this view and had recommended action upon these lines. The proposed resolution provides for a subcommittee to be appointed from the committees of the Senate and House having jurisdiction of the subject.

The resolution as originally introduced had provided in general terms for the investigation of the general subject of the regulation of interstate and foreign commerce. The committee by its amendment had changed this phraseology so as to authorize the committee to—

investigate the subject of Government control and regulation of interstate and foreign transportation, the efficiency of the existing system in protecting the rights of shippers and carriers, and in promoting the public interest; the incorporation or control of the incorporation of carriers and all proposed changes in the organization of the Interstate Commerce Commission and act to regulate commerce.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. Borah] by his proposed amendment seeks to amend this by adding:

The subject of Government ownership of public utilities, such as telegraph, telephone, express companies, and railroads engaged in interstate and foreign commerce, and report as to the wisdom or feasibility of Government ownership of such utilities, and the comparative worth or efficiency of Government regulation and control as compared with Government ownership and regulation.

I contend, Mr. President, that it would be much better to confine the proposed investigation to the question of Government regulation. That regulation has been thus far, in my judgment, highly successful, and it can be made more efficient through proper legislation. Unless, of course, regulation involves not only reasonable rates to the shippers but fair returns to the carriers, it will fail of its purpose, for a fair return to the carriers is essential in order to secure the investment of money in needed extensions and improvements, and unless the regulation results in fair rates to the shippers, the whole public purpose of the regulation fails. Logically we should complete and perfect public regulation before the question of public ownership is taken up. To investigate both questions at this time, when there are no fair methods of judgment or comparison, would produce confusion instead of certainty.

Of late years, until the foreign war stimulated the business of the country, the transportation interests had suffered, as have the other business interests of the country. Prior to the European war there was a gradual let down in business, industry, and production, which was necessarily reflected in the reduction of transportation. There has been no period in the history of transportation for the last 20 years in which the problem, so far as the finances of the railroads were concerned, was so serious. The railroads, having lost the political control which they once exercised, and being forced into the forum of public opinion, thought it wise to present their case to the public through addresses, pamphlets, and newspaper and magazine publications. The situation was one of diminishing traffic and increasing wages and taxes. They perhaps overstated their case, and the result was that whilst perhaps their appeals in a measure affected the public judgment and moderated governmental action regarding their activities, the effect was to alarm their own



stockholders and investors generally in railway securities and make it difficult for them to obtain the money needed for extensions and improvements. There had been no period in this generation, outside of the panic year of 1907, when it was so difficult for them to secure money. The negotiation of long-time bonds was impossible. The negotiation of short-time notes at high rates of interest was necessary, and the maturing of those notes from time to time increased their embarrassment.

The recent revival of industry has, of course, affected them favorably, and they are now approaching a time when it will be easier to make their negotiations; but all such negotiations would be hampered by a consideration and discussion of important questions relating to their regulation and control at a time when a presidential campaign is approaching and when the general inclination of both parties is to take a political rather than an economic view of such questions.

Besides this there are so many questions now pending before Congress relating to the civil war in Mexico and the international war abroad—questions of preparedness and questions of revenue—that it would be difficult to get a full consideration of the questions relating to transportation either by committees or by Congress. It appears wise, therefore, whilst providing for an intermediate inquiry, to postpone definite action until the period of calm shall come after the presidential election.

The language of the resolution is sufficiently broad to cover every possible inquiry regarding transportation without accentuating such inquiry as that which relates to Government ownership, an inquiry which might have the effect of producing uncertainty in arrangements that are now pending for the immediate financing of many railroads. I feel sure that logically full consideration of Government ownership should only come after the question of public regulation has been exhausted and its incompetency and inefficiency demonstrated. So far as I am concerned I feel greater confidence in the success of public regulation than ever. We have under it secured the most perfect railway system in the country with more reasonable rates of freight and fare than prevail anywhere in the world, and whilst there are still imperfections to be remedied it is evident that governmental ownership elsewhere had not evolved a system at all comparable with ours.

I refer to these considerations for the purpose of stating that, in my judgment, it is of the highest importance, both to the public, the shippers, and to the carriers themselves, that we should arrive at some rational solution of all the pending proposals without public excitement upon the subject. I think it would be a mistake to take up all the questions now by the respective committees of the Senate and House when both Congress and the country are intent more upon political than economic action and when the questions relating to existing international and civil war are so engrossing. It seems to me that the regulation of carriers is now reaching its crucial state. The carriers have found it difficult during this period to meet the demands of the country for expansion and enlargement, and that is a condition which is unfavorable to the shippers and to the business of the country.

I believe that public regulation is a success. I believe that it can be improved so as to make it more successful not only in the interest of the shippers themselves but in the interest of the carriers and with reference to the expansion and development of the railroad system to meet the requirements of the country. If the public regulation of railroads does not succeed, if it breaks down in any way, Government ownership must follow; but it seems to me that Government ownership can not logically be considered until the failure of public regulation is established.

Therefore, whilst the language of this resolution as reported by the committee would be broad enough if the committee saw fit to consider any well-considered scheme of Government ownership and report upon it, I would regard it as ill-advised to accept the amendment of the Senator from Idaho regarding the Government ownership of all public utilities. I believe that it would accentuate that form of governmental control. I do not believe that the committee will have time to enter upon that subject as it ought and make its proper recommendations with reference to the improvement of the regulation of the railroads of the country. Such an inquiry will be a very extensive one when made, involving an inquiry at very great expense, not only into local conditions but into conditions throughout the world, a careful examination of all the prevailing systems of Government ownership, and a comparison with our own.

I am, therefore, opposed to the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho, not so much because I am disinclined at some time to enter upon such an inquiry, but simply because

I think this is not the time logically for it, and I would not wish to emphasize in the public mind the idea that the Congress of the United States regards public regulation as a failure and is now prepared to enter upon the consideration of Government ownership.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Chair understand that in the absence of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] the Senator from Nevada is offering the amendment?

Mr. NEWLANDS. No; the Senator from Idaho has been here. I supposed he was here. He was here when I commenced my remarks.

Mr. BRYAN. May I inquire of the Senator from Nevada if the language printed in italics is what he refers to when speaking of the Borah amendment?

Mr. NEWLANDS. No; the Borah amendment is a separate printed amendment. The amendment in italics is the committee amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Idaho has offered no amendment. The Chair heard the Senator from Nevada read it, and was in doubt as to whether the Senator from Nevada intended to offer it.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I will state that I understood the Senator from Idaho had given notice that he would offer it, and I thought it proper in my preliminary remarks to call attention to it.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Nevada why it was that the proposed law carrying out the platform pledge of his party, as I understood it was for that purpose, providing for the regulation of stocks and bonds of interstate railroads, was allowed to die after it had passed the House and then been reported by the Senate committee and placed on the calendar of the Senate? Why is it that now we should want to make an investigation as to whether we ought to pass anything of that kind when I supposed it had been determined at least by the Senator's own party that such a law was necessary?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I will state to the Senator that a bill was passed in the House of Representatives providing for the control by the Interstate Commerce Commission of the securities issued by interstate carriers. That bill came to the Senate and was reported to the Senate with amendments. The understanding of the committee when that report was made was that the bill provided for the absolute control by the Interstate Commerce Commission, a national authority, of the securities of railway carriers, and it was assumed, though it was not expressed in the bill in that connection, that under the decision of the Supreme Court such a control exercised under national authority would practically oust the jurisdiction of the State commissions regarding the securities of carriers engaged in interstate commerce but organized under the laws of the respective States. After that report was made Mr. Brandeis and Mr. Rublee appeared before the Interstate Commerce Commission and urged that it would be exceedingly unwise to provide for the absolute control of these securities; that in some way the Nation might be committed to existing issues which might have been unlawfully or wrongfully made and would be estopped from attacking them hereafter; and they insisted upon it that the supervision of the national commission should be confined simply to requiring statements from these carriers to the Interstate Commerce Commission and their full publicity, thus relying upon publicity as a control and a corrective rather than upon the absolute control of the commission. The views of Mr. Brandeis were sustained by some of the members of the committee, whose attention, I presume, had for the first time been called to the importance of the subject, and it was apparent that unless the matter were reconsidered by the committee there would be a long and protracted debate on the floor of the Senate over that question.

We were then toward the close of a long session, during which the most important questions relating to banking and trade had been considered. Congress was wearied and it was thought inadvisable to press the bill at that Congress. That Congress was followed by the last session, a short session, and then as the result of mutual consultation, particularly upon this side of the House, with reference to a legislative program which could be put through in so short a session, it was not deemed wise to bring up that measure.

We are now in a long session, but we are approaching a political campaign, and, as the Senator knows, politics have much more consideration in such a Congress, and always have had, than economics. It is therefore deemed wise to have both committees, through a subcommittee, act upon all these various measures that have been presented with a view to sifting them



thoroughly, holding public hearings and making a report as soon as practicable, thus presenting to their respective committees their concrete judgment as to the measures to be enacted.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator another question before he sits down. Does the Senator believe that the Senate and Congress and the President and the entire country ought to suspend operations after it was, I think, conceded, at least by the Senator's party and a great many others, including myself, that it ought to be passed, after it had passed the House and been reported favorably by his committee to the Senate, because two men, Mr. Brandeis and Mr. Rublee, appeared before the committee and requested suspension of action, that the entire country ought to halt and wait? If it be true that it was only a question of waiting, why is it that at the beginning of this Congress the Senator and his committee having had all the information before it did not propose the bill that had so nearly been passed before? Why is it necessary to investigate further?

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I yield.

Mr. CUMMINS. If the Senator from Nevada will allow me, I desire to say that while I am sure the chairman of the committee wishes to be absolutely accurate, as a member of the committee and one who has heard the statement that he has just made, I am bound to dissent from some of its details. I can not agree that the Committee on Interstate Commerce suspended or abandoned the bill which the Senator from Nebraska refers to because it did not meet the views of Mr. Brandeis and Mr. Rublee. Whatever effect their views may have had on members of the committee, I am sure the Senator from Nevada does not mean to say that the committee itself accepted the opinions of these gentlemen, eminent as they are, and through their advice or influence reached the conclusion that no further efforts would be made to pass the bill. There were some of us who were very anxious that the bill should be pressed at all times, not only during the latter part of the long session but during the short session as well.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I do not think the words which I used could convey the impression at all that we suspended operations simply because Mr. Brandeis and Mr. Rublee appeared before our committee. There were several members of the committee who had given most thorough and conscientious consideration to all the railway problems that have involved us for years who seemed inclined to sympathize with that view. It was perfectly apparent that a long debate and contention would take place over the bill and that it would be impossible to conclude it at the long session of Congress.

I will further state that the business of the committee is not suspended and will not be suspended by the adoption of this joint resolution. It is entirely within the province of the Interstate Commerce Committee to take up any of the measures that are now pending before it.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the Senator from Nevada permit me to ask him another question there?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. If the passage of this joint resolution will not suspend the operations of the committee, I should like to ask the Senator if, notwithstanding the passage of the joint resolution, the committee of which the Senator has the honor to be the chairman expects soon to report to Congress the bill, or a similar bill, providing for the limitation of the issue of stocks and bonds by interstate carriers?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I can not state what the committee expects to do. I am, however, willing at any time to bring before that committee any measure that is presented in the Congress of the United States by any Senator, and to bring it up on the request of a Senator for the consideration of the committee.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator is chairman of the committee; he has the same authority and influence with the committee that chairmen generally have; and he is perhaps often authorized to speak by those in control of his party on matters that are the subject of party consideration; and so I should like to ask him whether he intends to press such a measure. Is it the intention of the Senator, so far as he can control his committee, to bring out a bill here that will regulate the issuance of stocks and bonds by interstate carriers, regardless of the joint resolution which is now pending?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I can not accept any language which indicates that I have any control over the committee. That committee is composed of gentlemen of intelligence and independence, and the committee acts according to its own judgment, not according to mine. If, however, the Senator asks me as to my

personal views, I shall be very candid with him and will give them.

I believe that as to all the measures which relate to securities, which relate to the reorganization of the commission, and to other important amendments of the interstate-commerce act, it would be wise to turn over their consideration to a subcommittee proposed to be appointed by this joint resolution, if it passes, and to defer action upon them until we get their report. I believe that in that way we shall get a more perfect scheme of legislation than we shall get by two committees of Congress acting in a detached way upon these very important questions at a time when the country is intent upon political rather than economic questions, and when most important questions relating to finance, revenue, and pending wars are absorbing our attention.

Mr. TOWNSEND and Mr. STONE addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, with the nominal purpose of the pending resolution I am in accord. Any real information intended to make the Interstate Commerce Commission more useful, to rid it of unnecessary burdens, to strengthen it in its ability to carry out the purposes for which it was created should be obtained; and while I have little faith in investigations by men with fixed and preconceived ideas on the subjects to be investigated, still I can imagine that the commission or committee proposed, if constituted of men who will recognize and report facts, whether pleasant or otherwise, and who will devote the study and work contemplated by this resolution, can be of service to the Congress in its future considerations of the interstate-commerce law. I am going to support the resolution on that theory. It is proper, however, that the Senate should know the possibilities under the measure and the immediate cause of its appearance here.

I am informed by credible authority that this resolution has the indorsement of the President. He is reported as saying that the interstate-commerce law is breaking down and that the railroads should be untrammelled. He also desires, in the interest of nonpartisan legislation, that the proposed committee shall not report until after election. I think he is not likely to be disappointed in the last particular, for the work to be performed by the committee would more likely require two years to complete it than that it could be completed in eight months.

If the President also desired that no interstate-commerce legislation be enacted until after election, this resolution would furnish an excellent excuse to his followers in Congress to postpone such legislation. Of course, whether action on new matters is had or not will rest with Congress, but, judging the future by the past, I have no doubt of the potency of the President's wish in this regard.

I appreciate the President's desire for nonpartisan legislation. It is novel to this administration. Perhaps he has in mind his preparedness program, which has no hope except by the aid of Republicans. I have known that in Democratic as well as in Republican administrations not all of wisdom or patriotism rests with majorities.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I do.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I want to preface my question with the statement that I fully agree with the Senator from Michigan in his expression as to the desirability of having this work done in a nonpartisan way. I myself believe that all legislation ought to be nonpartisan, and that is what suggested the question. The regulation of stocks and bonds was a plank in the platform of the Democratic Party. I myself approve it and believe in it; but when that party undertook to carry out that part of the platform, all at once, for some unseen cause, the program seemed to have been changed and stopped. Now, I want to ask the Senator if this is not politics, and nothing but politics—if it is not merely to lay a foundation so as to give an excuse when going before the country in the coming campaign for not having complied with the agreement they made with the people in their platform adopted at Baltimore in regard to the issuance of stocks and bonds?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I had hoped to express myself on that subject when I reached the point, although I confess that I had not paid much attention to the Baltimore platform, as I did not suppose that it had any binding force upon Democrats at this time. If it contains any unbroken plank, I do not know which it is.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to ask the Senator if he does not believe in the coming national campaign as to whatever



part of the Baltimore platform has not been complied with—which will probably be a large share of it—the Democrats will have various excuses as to why it was not complied with, and is not this joint resolution the foundation of an excuse for not having done one of the things promised in the Baltimore platform?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I think that is entirely probable. But the expressed excuse for this resolution is the statement that the interstate-commerce law is breaking down and that there is need for more favorable treatment of the railroads. Now, I agree that the Interstate Commerce Commission is not as strong with the people as it was 18 months ago, but I probably can not agree with the President as to the cause of its lessened strength, and certainly if the railroads are unjustly shackled I want to know it and to assist in breaking those shackles, for an injury to the railroads is an injury to the people.

It is my belief that the Interstate Commerce Commission is not as popular with the people as it was prior to its last decision in the 5 per cent rate-increase case, and when the people lose confidence in the commission its usefulness becomes impaired. I have never complained at increases of rates allowed by the commission when its decisions were based upon the law governing rates, viz. "they shall be just and reasonable," and this has been construed by the courts to mean sufficient to yield a reasonable return to the carrier upon the property actually employed for the public use. The railroads should have a right to such returns, but the makers of that law never expected that it would be construed to guarantee profit under any management however faulty, nor to pay dividends on stock however attenuated with water. In other words, the commission was not created to establish a policy for the control of carriers' finances. The first decision of the commission denying the 5 per cent raise was right under the law and the submitted evidence. The railroads had not attempted to prove the justness and reasonableness of the rates in the proposed schedules. They simply said "we need the money." The second decision, six months later than the first, reversed the former on exactly the same state of facts and without any additional testimony except that the European war had broken out. What a blanket for covering mistakes that war has furnished this administration! Why the war created revenue for the carriers. It did not reduce their net incomes.

Now, I have great faith in the character and purposes of the Interstate Commerce Commission. It has always been composed of good and capable men. It is one of the most useful branches of the public service. The final decision in the 5 per cent rate increase case shows that a majority of that commission, however, are very human.

They yielded, I believe, to Executive suggestion. I do not know that the President talked with members of the commission after that first decision, but I do know—if newspaper reports are to be believed—that railroad officials in influential numbers called upon the President and that he was reported as being out of harmony with that decision and as favoring the proposed increase. I do know that the commission reversed itself and thereby lost some of the confidence of the people. The people should understand, however, that the commission has not, to my knowledge, followed that decision as a precedent, although railroad attorneys have invoked it.

The Interstate Commerce Commission was created as a people's tribunal. The railroads were under the law given the right to appeal to the court, but the shipper was allowed no such privilege. The commission was supposed to act for him. It could even proceed in his behalf on its own initiative. Why should he be permitted to ask for a review of his agents' acts? Of course, the commission should not be permitted to do wrong to a carrier, for, I repeat, a wrong to a railroad is a wrong to the patrons of that road and to the State, but it should be exceedingly zealous in safeguarding the rights of the people.

The pendulum seems to have swung to the opposite extreme. A few years ago railroad baiting and illy considered railroad legislation was the business of some men, and now the "public-damned" policy seems to be more popular. I am willing that a committee be appointed to investigate the interstate-commerce law, but I want it to report facts to the end that unwise laws may be repealed and new legislation enacted to carry out the purposes of the act of 1906.

I know that the Interstate Commerce Commission is overloaded with work. It has been the dumping ground for all kinds of legislative enactments, which have required much time and which should have been assigned to other agencies.

From the very nature of things it can not personally consider the thousand matters submitted to it. It can not even read the testimony taken by its agents in the hundreds of rate and

regulation cases brought before it. I doubt if it is possible for its members, individually, to read the more than 2,000 legal briefs presented to them annually. A great part of this work is done by examiners. Some of these examiners have been forced upon the commission by high political influence. All, or nearly all, are paid insufficient salaries; that is, the salaries in many cases are not sufficient to secure permanently men big enough for the job and many of them are not capable of performing the great work to which they are assigned.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JAMES in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator's statement, almost startling, that incompetent men are forced upon the commission through political influence suggests a question to me. I want to ask the Senator whether, in view of that statement, it would not be almost necessary to amend the pending joint resolution by providing that the committee shall investigate as to whether political influence, proceeding from any political party at any time, has been instrumental in pushing onto the commission appointees who in reality have to do work which the law really contemplated the commission should do?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I think the joint resolution is broad enough to cover that, if the committee has a disposition to do it. I think it is a serious matter. I am mentioning these things on the assumption that the commission is breaking down; and I want to find out, if I can, why this is so. If it is so. Some of these examiners are high-grade men, but they seize the first opportunity to accept better positions outside the commission. Their experience with the commission makes them valuable to private and corporate interests, and they very properly accept the more remunerative employment. If this proposed committee shall show the true situation in reference to these and similar matters, it will be worth while.

The commission has not broken down and it will not break down if Congress does not ask it to do things impossible of performance, if it is not loaded down with incompetent political subordinates, and if it is not coerced by Executive influence.

I shall vote for this resolution, because it is reasonably possible that the joint committee created by it may disclose facts which will enable and induce Congress to strengthen the great Interstate Commerce Commission in its efforts to perform its duties in an unprejudiced and fearless manner under the law.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I yield.

Mr. SHERMAN. Does the Senator know what these law examiners are paid annually?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I think one or two get around \$5,000, and their salaries range from that figure down.

Mr. SHERMAN. Five thousand dollars is the maximum?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I understand that is the highest salary that is paid to an examiner, although I am not certain that there may not be exceptional cases.

Mr. SHERMAN. Does the Senator think that compensation or a lower one will secure a high type of legal ability?

Mr. TOWNSEND. No; I have been saying that I did not think the salaries were sufficient, because the work of these examiners is of the very highest importance. It is of almost as much importance, possibly, as that of the commissioners themselves. So this question ought to be investigated, and a report made.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President—

Mr. TOWNSEND. I yield further to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. SHERMAN. If I understand the duties of these examiners, some of whom I have the good fortune to know personally, let me inquire if their examination of the questions that are referred to them is not reduced to writing and reported back to the commission, and whether in the main the commission does not adopt the report of the examiner as the decision of the commission?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I think the commission is compelled to do that. It can not read these cases. It is an absolute impossibility for it to do so. It must rely very largely upon the reports of the examiners.

Mr. SHERMAN. These examiners ought to be possessed of excellent ability, ought they not? Because they are the ones who make the original examination, and hear the witnesses, and arrive at conclusions, and report them back.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I think so. So, Mr. President, I say that I am in favor of the resolution if some of these matters shall

have been investigated impartially and fearlessly, with an idea, not of bolstering up some particular theory, but of strengthening the Interstate Commerce Commission, which is the people's forum. It was created as a people's forum.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to ask the Senator if he favors the enactment by Congress of a law giving the Interstate Commerce Commission the right to regulate the issue of stocks and bonds by interstate railroads?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I am not sure whether I do or not. I have been in favor of that proposition. I am not entirely clear about it now. Possibly if I could frame the law I might be in favor of it; but knowing, as I do know, that a result might occur that would be detrimental rather than beneficial, without doing any good to anybody, I should hesitate to say as a general proposition that I am in favor of a law to that effect.

Mr. NORRIS. Then, I should like to ask the Senator whether he is in favor of any legislation, such as has been repeatedly suggested by the Interstate Commerce Commission, that would regulate some of the admitted evils? I will put it broadly, and ask the Senator whether there is any legislation in regard to the regulation of railroads that he now favors?

Mr. TOWNSEND. That I now favor?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; that the Senator would like to see enacted into law.

Mr. TOWNSEND. It is possible that some durable legislation facilitating railroad financing may be necessary. I would prefer that Congress enact it rather than to permit the commission to do it.

Mr. NORRIS. Does not the Senator believe that this very resolution that we are going to adopt will be used as a buffer to prevent the enactment of that legislation, and that the cry will always go up, "You must wait two or three years more until this joint committee reports"?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I said at the beginning of my remarks that that was possible under this resolution. If the President—and I say "President" because he has been very potent in matters of legislation—should desire that no legislation be considered, either before the election or afterwards during his term, I think his desire would have a good chance of being carried out; for while Congress has the power to consider and pass legislation regardless of this resolution, yet the probabilities are that if any effective legislation, at least, is offered, this resolution will be presented as a buffer—to use the Senator's term—to prevent its consideration. I think it is possible.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan further yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I yield.

Mr. SHERMAN. Will the Senator favor us with his opinion as to the cause of over 40,000 miles of railways in the United States being operated by receivers at the present time?

Mr. TOWNSEND. No; I do not believe I will go into that, Mr. President, because, really—

Mr. SHERMAN. Is it an absence of legislation or too much?

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. I wish to ask the Senator if he does not think it is due to the absence of any law that makes the robbery of the stockholders of a railroad company, such as happened in the case of the New Haven, the Rock Island, and the Frisco, a crime? Is it not because the law at present permits those who ought to represent the stockholders to take advantage of their position of trust to sell them out, as was done in every one of those instances?

In other words, does not the Senator believe that because the ordinary investor knows that the stock of any railroad may be manipulated in that way, and therefore made unsafe, he refuses to invest in it, and that makes of it, as a matter of fact, to a great extent a gambling institution? Ought not a law to be passed that would prevent the kind of a situation that has been illustrated by the roads I have mentioned, and would not that place the stock of all railroads upon a basis that would invite the honest investor?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Answering the last question first, I do not know whether it would or not. If such a law can be passed, and if such a condition is due to the lack of law in that respect, of course, I would be in favor of passing it; but I do not know always just exactly what causes that condition. I know that seemingly excellent laws are passed sometimes, but bad conditions still exist; and I am quite inclined to agree with the sug-

gestion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] that as a general proposition we have too much law.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Yes; I yield.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I just wanted to cite one more instance, in addition to the cases mentioned by the Senator from Nebraska, where it seemed to me that the unregulated capitalization of a railroad company may bring about a receivership, and that is the case of the Union Pacific Railroad. It has been described on this floor a number of times, and I will only mention it in outline again.

The result of the transaction was that the Union Pacific Railroad is incumbered with \$100,000,000 of indebtedness with no corresponding property in return. The earning capacity of the railroad was not increased by incurring the \$100,000,000 of indebtedness. It is perfectly obvious that in a situation of that kind it is more difficult for the railroad company to meet its obligations. If it goes in debt without any return it is very likely, even in normal times, the condition described by the Senator from Illinois may result.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I have said all I care to say on this subject, and conclude practically as I began with the statement that I am in favor of any commission that will honestly investigate and get at the facts upon which Congress can proceed to strengthen the great Interstate Commerce Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the first amendment of the committee to the joint resolution.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, is this on the committee amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first amendment offered by the committee.

Mr. BORAH. I do not care to be heard on that.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I have no special objection to this particular amendment, but I desire to be heard at some length on the joint resolution itself. I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS]. I shall not be able to conclude what I have to say at 2 o'clock, and I was not ready to go on to-day. That was the reason why I asked the Senator in the beginning not to make his motion to take up this joint resolution to-day. If it is necessary, however, I presume I can take up the time until 2 o'clock. I do not care to do that. I am perfectly willing to vote on this amendment if the Senator would be willing then that the matter should go over until I can look up a few things that I am not ready to take up at the present time.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I am afraid I will not have another opportunity of bringing up this matter.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator must realize that 2 o'clock will soon be here. He will have just as much time to-morrow as he had to-day.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I am inclined to think the Philippine bill will be temporarily laid aside to enable us to complete the consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. NORRIS. That will take unanimous consent, will it not?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I do not think it will. I think it can be done on motion.

Mr. NORRIS. We will see, when we reach it, what it will take. Of course I can take up—as I will have to take up, if the Senator insists on it, and no one else wants to talk—about three times as much time as I would necessarily take if I had a few hours to arrange what I have to say. Since, however, the Senator does not feel inclined to grant me that reasonable request I will proceed.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. NORRIS. I do.

Mr. BORAH. Might not we dispose of these amendments, if the Senator has no objection?

Mr. NORRIS. I have no objection. If the Senator was willing, I was willing to concede that much to dispose of these amendments and let the resolution progress that far; but he is not willing, when they are disposed of, to lay the joint resolution over until to-morrow.

Mr. BORAH. It will take five minutes to dispose of the amendments, and we will be that far along to-morrow.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; but I do not feel disposed to yield now, unless the Senator would be willing that the joint resolution should go over until to-morrow.

Mr. CATRON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.



The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Harding	Nelson	Sterling
Bankhead	Hardwick	Newlands	Stone
Beckham	Hitchcock	Norris	Sutherland
Borah	Hollis	Oliver	Swanson
Brandeggee	Hughes	Overman	Thomas
Bryan	Husting	Page	Tillman
Cañon	James	Phelan	Townsend
Chamberlain	Jones	Pittman	Underwood
Chilton	Kenyon	Poinexter	Vardaman
Clapp	Kern	Reed	Wadsworth
Clark, Wyo.	Lane	Shafroth	Walsh
Clarke, Ark.	Lea, Tenn.	Sheppard	Weeks
Colt	Lippitt	Sherman	Williams
Dillingham	McLean	Shields	Works
du Pont	Martin, Va.	Smith, Ariz.	
Fletcher	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Ga.	
Gallinger	Myers	Smoot	

Mr. KERN. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. SHIPLEY]. He is paired with the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH]. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. OVERMAN. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. SIMMONS].

Mr. STONE. I wish to announce, and let it stand for the day, the absence of the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY] on account of illness.

Mr. CHILTON. I make the same announcement that I made on the former roll call as to my colleague [Mr. GOFF] being absent on account of illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate bill 381.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] whether he has any objection to the Philippine government bill being temporarily laid aside in order that we may complete the consideration of the resolution?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I should like to ask the Senator from Nevada how long it would probably take to finish the consideration of the resolution?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I have heard of but two Senators who desire to speak, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS].

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. NEWLANDS. With pleasure.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to suggest to the Senator that it will not, in my judgment, take near as much time if the resolution should go over for a day or two as it would take if proceeded with now. I have not looked at some records that I want to examine. I have no desire to delay the resolution, I want to say to the Senator, although I want to be heard somewhat at length. If I have to go on to-day I shall have to stumble through a great deal of stuff that I would probably eliminate if I had a little time.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will also say to the Senator from Nevada that I desire to speak a short time on the resolution, and if he should undertake to force it through this afternoon I promise him it will not pass to-day.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I understand that it requires unanimous consent to lay the Philippine government bill aside. Can it be done on motion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It can be done by motion, of course, but it displaces the Philippine government bill in case the motion is sustained by the Senate.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Of course I would not want to bring about that effect. So I assume the resolution will have to go over. I will ask the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] whether he will be prepared to go on at the close of the morning business to-morrow?

Mr. NORRIS. I think so, as far as I know, unless investigations I intend to make should go further than I expect. I have no disposition to put it over.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I wish to say to the Senator from Nebraska that I have had no disposition to cut him off from a full opportunity to debate the resolution, but I have made several attempts to bring it up. The other day I postponed its consideration upon the request of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] and upon his assurance that he would help secure the early disposition of the resolution. I should like the Senator from Nebraska to unite with me in bringing the matter to an early conclusion.

Mr. NORRIS. I will not try to delay it for the purpose of delay. I have tried to delay it to-day because I was not ready to go on and would not do so unless I was forced to proceed. I

want a little time to get some of the records together that I wish to use.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I give notice, then, that to-morrow morning at the close of the routine morning business I shall call up the resolution for action.

#### THE GOVERNMENT OF THE PHILIPPINES.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 381) to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, inasmuch as we have just had a call for a quorum, I am going to ask the unanimous consent of the Senate that the bill and all pending amendments may be passed to a final vote not later than 3 o'clock on Thursday of this week.

Mr. SMOOT. I think under the rule that request could not be complied with now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is of opinion that under the rule it will be necessary to have a call of the roll before the request for unanimous consent can be put. There has been intervening business between the former roll call of the Senate and the present time.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Then, for information, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Utah whether there would be any objection to such a request?

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT] is out of the Chamber just at this moment. I think he is at lunch. I do not believe the question ought to be asked in his absence, even in the way the Senator has put it. I could not say, as far as I am concerned, whether there is any objection to setting a day certain for a vote or not.

Mr. LIPPITT entered the Chamber.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator from Rhode Island has entered the Chamber. I will state to him that I am making an informal inquiry whether there would be objection to fixing an hour on a day for a final vote on the bill and all pending amendments.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, until the pending amendment, what is known as the Clarke amendment, is disposed of I think it would not be easy to get a unanimous-consent agreement fixing a day for voting on the bill. It seems to me that no one knows to just how much discussion that amendment is going to lead. I know several Senators who are inclined to express an opinion in regard to it. So I think it would not be a favorable time to make the request, I will say to the Senator from Nebraska. I personally have no disposition at all to delay a vote on the bill.

Mr. COLT. Mr. President, I desire to address the Senate very briefly in opposition to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE].

The Filipino people are now engaged, with our help, in solving the problem of popular government, and if we grant them independence in the near future it is manifest that they will undertake to establish a system of popular government in some form; in other words, a government by the people and without the aid of a monarch or an aristocracy.

Now, it is clear from the experience of every nation which has tried to establish a stable popular government that we are not giving the Filipino people sufficient time in two or four years to work out this problem.

Can we expect the Filipino people to accomplish something which France was unable to accomplish, which Spain was unable to accomplish, which the Central and South American Republics were unable to accomplish, and which no nation in the world which has made the attempt has been able to accomplish?

It took France 80 years, from 1790 to 1870, to establish a stable popular government, and before she was successful her Government was three times overturned by the populace of Paris, three times by the army, three times by foreign invaders, while one constitution succeeded another in rapid succession. Can we expect more of the Filipino people than of the French people?

The efforts of Spain to establish popular government began in 1812, and after some 40 military insurrections it has ended in a restoration of monarchy; and the experience of France and Spain has been the experience of other European nations in their attempts to establish popular government during the past century, with the possible exception of Switzerland.

Turning to the Western Hemisphere, we are all familiar with the history of the Central and South American Republics and the length of time it took them to establish a stable popular government. It is safe to say that it was 50 years from

the times these colonies of Spain declared their independence before they succeeded in this undertaking.

Not to mention minor insurrections, there were more than 80 revolutions in these Republics during the first half century of their existence. Mr. Meyer, of the Library of Congress, has given me some data on this subject, which I ask to be made a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Chair hears none.

The matter referred to is as follows:

*Data in relation to revolutions in South American and Central American States and in Mexico.*  
[Not including minor insurrections.]

Country.	Date of liberation.	Number of revolutions during first half century.
<b>South America:</b>		
Argentina.....	1812	7
Bolivia.....	1825	7
Brazil.....	1822	1
Chile.....	1818	13
Colombia.....	1819	5
Ecuador.....	1822	3
Paraguay.....	1811	( <sup>1</sup> )
Peru.....	1821	6
Uruguay.....	1830	8
Venezuela.....	1819	4
Mexico.....	1813	10
<b>Central America:</b>		
Costa Rica.....	1821	1
Guatemala.....	1821	8
Honduras.....	1821	7
Nicaragua.....	1821	4
Salvador.....	1821	1
Total.....		85

<sup>1</sup> Practical dictatorship.

Mr. COLT. From this compilation it appears that there were 13 revolutions in Chile during the first 50 years of her independence, 7 in Argentina, 7 in Bolivia, 6 in Peru, 5 in Colombia, and 10 in Mexico. The number of revolutions in the other Republics will be found in the annexed paper.

And it may be observed in this connection that it took us, with all our experience in self-government, some 13 years, or from 1776 to 1789, before we succeeded in establishing a stable, popular government.

When we consider the history of popular government and the present conditions in the Philippines, I am convinced that it is impossible for the Filipino people to establish a stable popular government in two or four years, and hence that it would be an act of injustice toward them and a breach of good faith on the part of the United States to grant them independence at the time proposed in this amendment.

As to the second proposition contained in this amendment, I am unable to see how the United States can, during the present war, obtain any pledge from other nations guaranteeing the sovereignty and independence of the Philippines; and, if the times were normal, I can find no sufficient ground upon which the great powers would enter into any such obligation. If this should turn out to be true, and the United States alone should guarantee the independence of the Philippines for five years after parting with our sovereignty, then we are left in the position of assuming a responsibility without the power of enforcing it. For these reasons, Mr. President, I shall vote against this amendment.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I do not share the views of able Senators who have spoken upon this question with reference to the attitude of Japan toward this Government or of the attitude of Japan with reference to our possession of the Philippines. I do not believe that the Japanese people are seeking difficulty with the United States, and I have never seen anything which indicated to me that our possession of the Philippines was at all irritating to those people or to the Japanese Government. In any event, any vote that I shall cast upon this amendment or the bill will in no wise be colored or controlled by what is supposed to be the attitude of Japan or any other nation toward the United States. I look upon it as a matter which concerns the United States alone and its policy. What is our interest and what is our duty toward the Philippine people? When I shall have determined to my satisfaction these questions I shall not be concerned about the supposed views or supposed irritableness of other nations.

Neither do I believe, I desire to say by way of digression, that there is any great power seeking difficulty or anticipating

trouble with the United States. Our troubles at the present time with other nations arise not out of any specific desire on the part of those nations to have difficulty with the United States but simply because their great interests and our interests inevitably under the conditions which are now prevailing conflict. It is quite natural for those powers, struggling as they are for existence, to urge their rights and to pursue their policies to the limit, and it is quite proper that the United States should guard its own interests. But whatever the difficulties are or may have been, it has never occurred to me that we ought to interpret the situation as we find it now throughout the world, and the difficulties which now present themselves to us as a desire upon the part of any nation to have difficulty with the United States. I do not believe that any of the belligerent nations are pursuing a course with a view of bringing about unfriendly relations. It has been assumed that because of Japan's favor to the allies in this war that the allies would be bound to join in any ambitious program which Japan might have at the close of the war, and that therein is to be found a menace to the United States.

Nations do not act upon the moral obligations of yesterday but upon the primary interests of to-day. They do not consider in making up their policies the friendships and relations of the past, but the advantages and opportunities of the present or the future. It seems in these days that even treaty obligations are of slight or no consequence as against present exigencies or future expectations. The alliances of this supreme tragedy may last a little longer than usual by reason of the fearful welding, but even they will yield to the changing interest and lurking jealousies of the swift coming years. Only a short time ago Japan and Russia were at war, and we see them now in practical alliance. We see Germany and England within most recent years in the friendliest relationship. We see them now in deadly conflict. I do not get much enlightenment or imbibe any considerable fear from the present alliances. If you will tell me where the vital and material interest of this or that nation will lie a decade from now, I will tell you something of the dangers of attack from that source. But if you undertake to talk to me of the present alliances and friendships and from these to deduce future programs and actions I am unable to become very deeply interested or greatly alarmed. We do not know what the future interests will be, and therefore we do not know what the future alliances will be. All the more reason why we should be constantly prepared. The patriotism of a people is a noble but a singular virtue. It ignores the appeal of past friendships and soon forgets the insults of former enemies.

So, Mr. President, any condition which may be presented at this time as to the supposed attitude or state of mind of any great power would have nothing to do with any vote which I might cast upon this bill.

In saying that I do not believe that Japan is seeking trouble with this country or that either the central powers or the allies are formulating plans or nursing designs looking to an immediate attack upon the United States dependent only on the result of the war, I do not, of course, argue against a reasonable program of preparedness. I would assist, however, if I could, in raising the discussion of so vital a problem out of the region of temporary fear, based upon conditions which may pass with the hour, into the region of deliberate conviction based upon those sound and permanent principles which must accompany national power so long as it endures. Under the leadership of Col. Roosevelt, eight or nine years ago, I voted for four battleships to be at once constructed, and to be followed by a policy which would have given in this hour not a third-rate but in any event a second-rate Navy. I voted then as I did because I could not well understand how a great Nation with thousands of miles of seacoast and a stupendous wealth at the water's edge, with its commerce extending to and ramifying all parts of the earth and entering upon its career of world power, could safely be without a great Navy. It seemed to me to be as indispensable to our national honor and prestige as any other great principle upon which the Republic is founded; that in the vicissitudes of human affairs there may come a time, and no man knoweth in advance the time, when force, and nothing but force, would mean safety, mean civilization, mean national integrity, mean national honor.

Washington, in his inaugural address, said:

There is a rank due to the United States among nations which will be imperiled, if not absolutely lost, by the reputation of weakness. If we desire to avoid insult, we must be able to repel it; if we desire to secure peace, one of the most powerful instruments of our rising prosperity, it must be known that we are at all times ready for war.

That is the principle, permanent and abiding, as essential before the war as now, upon which to build your program of preparedness. Not upon the theory of some supposed specific plan of attack, more likely false than true, but upon the prin-



ciple and the same principle that you police your cities—simply because so long as men are human disorders will sometimes arise, and so long as nationalism is the basis upon which human societies are organized conflicts will sometimes come. I have no faith in the permanency or effectiveness of any program of preparedness superinduced by or based upon present disturbances or conflicts. A policy begun in fear will end in failure. When the supposed causes seem to pass interest in the program will pass. Your arguments will no longer be backed up by concrete examples and your appropriations will cease. But a program, sir, based upon the broad and serene policy of Washington, as clear visioned and as long visioned as that of his doctrine of neutrality, and sustained by every truly great American from that hour to this, a program based upon education and intelligent conviction of the effect that it is indispensable to national safety and power at all times, will have some chance of being permanent and effective.

Take a lesson from recent history and see how futile are the plans and programs founded on passing incidents and how essential it is that we dig deeper and build, as Washington and Hamilton built, upon the verities of human nature and human experience as they are gathered not of a day but through the long sweep of the years. The spring of 1914 was the richest in promise of peace in the whole history of the world. The fringe of the millenium seemed to be lingering about the horizon everywhere. Another peace conference was soon to be held at The Hague. We were just getting ready to celebrate the centenary of the treaty of Ghent. Everybody was writing treaties. The Senate was ratifying them without discussion or consideration, provided they looked like peace treaties. Rulers were signing them with ostentatious ceremony.

The sleeping qualities of the human heart seemed really to be aroused and prepared to dominate all human conduct and all nations and all peoples, all races and all religions were soon to be united in a bond of universal peace, unending and unbreakable, and human misunderstandings, selfishness, and passion and war were to be known no more. One of the great peace advocates of the world declared in exultation that the world would never again witness a great war. But, sir, in August came the world conflict. The delegates to The Hague were interrupted in their journey by the submarines and the Zeppelins. Beneath the surface so calm and pacific were the old, ugly passions and prejudices and ambitions of men. Not only was the millenium postponed, but it is a serious question if civilization has not gone back many a decade. I would have no hopes, Mr. President, of any reasonable, permanent, and helpful program of preparedness if we are to continue to make this supposed enemy the moving power of the program. This great conflict has served to awaken and to startle, but it has not changed the principles upon which a nation should always build its program of preparedness.

I have digressed, Mr. President, from the discussion of the Philippine question to say this much upon this subject, because so much has been said and has been well said, so far as that is concerned, as to the supposition that our dealing with the Philippines and, indeed, our entire program of preparedness should be based rather upon conditions as they now present themselves than upon those great principles which, in my judgment, obtain just as much in peace as in war.

Mr. President, I want now to discuss for a time the Philippine question. It seems to me that there are two propositions, or two courses, or two policies, open to us in dealing with the Philippines. The first is to get out of the Philippines now, or as soon as we may, taking into consideration the necessity of certain delay necessary to the transfer of government. There is no doubt, I think, that this policy would be to the best interest of the United States if we were to view the matter wholly as a question of material interest or material welfare. I think that most of us, if we could roll back and reconstruct or redirect the events of the last quarter of a century, would leave the Philippine Islands just as we found them. I think most of us feel that it would have been better. But circumstances unusual prevailed which seemed to necessitate assuming the sovereignty over those islands. If we were now clear of the islands, our sovereignty withdrawn, so far as the people of the United States are concerned as to their material interests, it would be considered as altogether to our advantage. Any proposition to withdraw sovereignty within a reasonable time—that is, as soon as the transfer of the reins of government and the adjustment of American interests can be effected—has for its support the material interests of the people of the United States. I am bound to say, however, that if the Filipino people would be content to remain indefinitely and the people of the United States would eliminate all politics and settle down to the task

of training them for a higher civilization, that immediate withdrawal would not be for the best interest of the Filipino people themselves. It is the "if," however, which seems insurmountable.

The second proposition, Mr. President, is that of remaining in the Philippines until we shall have done something substantial and permanent in the way of instructing the Filipinos in self-government—in self-government as we understand it, because we have no capacity for teaching self-government upon any other plan. When we talk of teaching self-government in the Philippines it must necessarily be to some extent in harmony with the views of self-government as we entertain those views; in other words, if we stay there any longer than the necessary time to get out, it must be that we are staying there for the benefit of the Filipino people themselves—that we are not staying there for the benefit of the United States or for any material interest which the United States could have.

If we remain in the Philippines for the purpose of performing this obligation—that is, of teaching the Filipino people free government and the capacity to maintain independence—a practical question arises, namely, how long will it take us to perform that task? How long will it take to reconstruct the conception of government which is entertained by those people, if indeed any idea of government is entertained by them at all? After we determine, if we can, how long it will take, then is there anyone willing to declare that we are to remain there until the task is completed? If we do not stay until such time as we shall have accomplished the task in its fullness, will we have benefited them at all? In other words, can we accomplish anything there in the next 10 years or 15 years or 20 years or 25 or 30 or 35 or 40 years in the way of permanent value of permanent good to the Filipino people? I believe that if we were to leave the Filipino people within the next 2 or 3 or 4 years, they would be benefited by our presence there just as much as if we should stay there for 15 or 20 years, and then leave them. I say this for the reason that no people in the history of the world have ever acquired anything like a capacity for self-government within less than centuries. It has never been possible under any conditions for a people to acquire that great power except through centuries of struggle and sacrifice, even when they have had the guiding hand and controlling influence of higher and more civilized nations to lead them.

I think, therefore, the question presents itself in this way: Are we going to remain there until we fulfill the obligation in its entirety upon the basis of teaching those people the capacity for self-government? If so, how long will it take? As has been said by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COTT], it will not only take decades, but it will take decades upon decades to accomplish that. In other words, in so far as we can now foresee or formulate plans, it means the permanent holding of the Philippine Islands.

The Anglo-Saxon race was from 500 to 1,000 years in acquiring a capacity for self-government. France has been not only decades but centuries in working out the problem of self-government. For more than a hundred years the Mexican people have been struggling with the question of self-government, and, in my judgment, they are no nearer to it to-day than they were at the time that Hidalgo raised the insurrection of about 1810 and based his fight upon the principle of a true democracy.

The veneer of democracy is one thing and easily created. But real democracy, government by the people, is a wholly different thing and the most difficult of all governments to construct and maintain. The outward form of republicanism or democracy signifies nothing. It may conceal the most cruel, corrupt, and oppressive absolutism, as is instanced in the history of Mexico for the last 30 years. The most difficult lesson for a people to learn and the most elusive and difficult to retain after it has been learned is the lesson of self-government. The most tormenting problem ever given to a people for demonstration is the problem of democracy. It has its manifest blessings when wrought out to success, every one of which blessings, however, are purchased and enjoyed only through the most exacting devotion and the most inflexible public interest upon the part of an entire people. There can be no basic foundation for such a government other than the most widespread and thoroughly disseminated knowledge and character upon the part of the people. No people have ever acquired the capacity for self-government except through decades and centuries of the most grievous experience. Why talk to these people of independence now? They have not, as a people, the slightest conception of the duties, the sacrifices, and the obligations of free government. They have not as yet mastered the first lesson. To delude them into the belief that they are fit for self-government or that they soon will be is to work signal injustice to them.



If you point to the fact that there are brilliant and capable men in the Philippines, I concede it all. I in nowise seek to impeach their character or intellectual standing. But there is no country in the civilized or semicivilized world which may not produce a few men of great and brilliant attainments, men who may in their aspirations have some poetical conceptions of free government. Mexico had her Hidalgo, her Guerrero, her Juarez, her Madero. They built their castles in the upper air and gave the highest and noblest manifestations of their sincerity, for they died and were willing to die for their faith. But they had no foundation upon which to build. That without which free institutions are but a tormenting dream, to wit, a sturdy, self-reliant people, a people of intelligence, of fixed and wholesome habits and customs they did not have. The only thing in the world out of which you can build and the only thing which will for any length of time preserve a Republic is the character and wholeness and principles of the people, the masses. Sam Adams was successful in organizing his revolt and sustaining it because he appealed to men of unusual character, of exceptional training, of signal moral courage; men who had been educated in what was in some respects the most remarkable university the world has ever seen, the New England town meeting. Washington, in the convention of 1787, said in those famous lines that perhaps no government which they could form would be accepted by the people. But it was accepted. The people were equal to the task imposed upon them. What could those leaders have done without such a constituency?

If we stay there, therefore, to serve these people, what standard shall we set up? What must we do and what must they be willing for us to do?

When shall we expect the United States Government to announce that in its judgment these people should now be free and independent? Will it be when a few intelligent and capable men have developed sufficient capacity to maintain an aristocratic form of government or will it be when the masses have been educated and schooled into self-discipline and into that knowledge of public affairs and that sustained interest in the public welfare which makes possible a republic? Will we, in order to escape the burdens of our task like an impatient guardian anxious to be rid of the ward, be satisfied with a republic in form or in name but an aristocracy in fact—a government with a few cultured and ambitious men at the top and ignorance and dependence and peonage and slavery at the bottom—or will it be when there has been sown among the people that spirit of independence, that integrity of view, that vision which alone fits them for the onerous obligations of free government? The latter obligation is the one which this country must assume if it take up the task at all. To do less is to shirk responsibility, and we had better go now. To remain longer are expense and outlay for us and no permanent benefit to the Filipinos.

You can not take those people, with the training which they have had, or the lack of training, and rear the masses of the people themselves to the standard of self-government inside of half a century or a century. If we are to discuss the question of self-government within 17 years after we first went there, and promise those people independence, or hold that view up before them at a time when they have no conception of self-government, to my way of thinking it is infinitely better to turn them loose now, and let them work out their own destiny. We may spend our time and our means and our energy for the next 15 or 20 years, and, so far as permanent results are concerned, they will be no different than if we should leave the Philippines within the next 3 or 4 years.

So I say, Mr. President, we either ought to adopt the amendment which the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE] has submitted or we ought to eliminate, once and for all, all discussion of independence and let the Filipino people understand that the first lesson which they must learn is the lesson of self-government before they shall be permitted to assume the right of independence, and they must be permitted to know from us in plain but kindly language that they will not acquire that capacity for self-government within the next 50 or 100 years; that it is a long, tedious lesson, requiring patience and persistence beyond anything they seem to have contemplated.

Mr. President, there is one other feature of this matter we can not ignore in measuring the task before us. The power of a nationality struggling ever to become a nation is one of the most weird and persistent influences in all the affairs of the human family. The turmoil in Europe for the last 100 years has been largely by reason of the fact that some nationality has been dominated or controlled by a nation of a different nationality. A nationality and a nation are two different propositions. These people are entirely different in language, in cus-

toms, in habits, in tastes, in mental capacity. They are a nationality in and of themselves, so far as comparison with the United States is concerned, and it will take many years to reconstruct that nationality, if we can ever do it at all. I think I may say that it has never been accomplished satisfactorily and never tried for any considerable length of time without great sacrifice of human life.

In 1772 three of the great powers of Europe partitioned Poland; in 1793 they made that partition complete, and were supposed to have destroyed that great nationality; but, as some writer has said, the Polish agitator has been the nerve of revolution in Europe every hour since the partition took place. There has never been a great revolution struggling for better conditions in Europe since 1772 that has not in some respects been led or aided by great Polish patriots. The kings or the absolute powers which distributed their country distributed the patriotism and the desire for nationality throughout Europe and furnished the means by which to augment, and thereby further, every revolution in Europe since that time.

It seems impossible, Mr. President, to destroy that sentiment of nationality which at all times inheres in a people, and it seems to be as strong with races of inferior capacity, if I may use the term, as with races of a more developed standard.

I want to read a few lines, Mr. President, from the great Italian statesman, Mazzini, in regard to the proposition of one nation trying to dominate, control, or educate, or direct another nation or nationality. Speaking of the smaller nationalities of Europe which have been under the control of some larger nation, Mr. Mazzini said:

They struggled, they still struggle, for country and liberty; for a word inscribed upon a banner, proclaiming to the world that they also live, think, love, and labor for the benefit of all. They speak the same language, they bear about them the impress of consanguinity, they kneel beside the same tombs, they glory in the same tradition, and they demand to associate freely, without obstacles, without foreign domination in order to elaborate and express their idea, to contribute their stone also to the great pyramid of history. It is something moral which they are seeking, and this moral something is in fact, even politically speaking, the most important question in the present state of things. It is the organization of the European task. In principle, nationality ought to be to humanity that which division of labor is in a workshop—the recognized symbol of association; the assertion of the individuality of a human group called by its geographical position, its traditions, and its language to fulfill a special function in the European work of civilization.

Whether that function be small or great, inferior or superior, it seems to assert its right to existence against all the power of man to change or to redirect it; in other words, a review of the history of the world shows that there is a logic of things and a logic of events which no human agency can change or redirect, and one of them is founded upon the great desire of every nationality at some time to become a nation.

Now, Mr. President, let us examine for a moment the conception of government which obtains in the Philippines after the years which we have been there—and perhaps we have done as good a work in the Philippines as ever was accomplished by any people toward a dependent people. I read from the testimony of ex-President Taft, on page 368, at the bottom of the page. He is there discussing the presentation of the views of leading Filipinos upon the question of independence:

Well, they said, they wanted to file a brief with me; and they did so—and these were leading educated Filipinos. In that brief they went on to enumerate the number of offices that there were in the municipalities and the provinces and the central government; and then they gave statistics of the *Ilustrados*, the educated people in the island; and they proved that the *Ilustrados* were more than twice as many as the offices to be filled; and they said that with two shifts that would give a competent government, and self-government. [Laughter.] Well, I explained to them that it was not the capacity to fill offices that gave a capacity for self-government to a people, it was public opinion, and that if they did not have broad popular public opinion to control people in office, they were not fit for self-government.

Then he further says:

I took a committee of Senators and Representatives out to the Philippines when I was Secretary of War, in 1905, and Fisk Warren, an anti-imperialist from Boston, visited the islands at the same time, because he thought that with my prejudice and my bitterness of feeling I could not be relied on to show the party the real capacity of the Filipino people for government; and so he demanded, in the name of the Filipino people, that I give the Filipino people an opportunity to be heard. And after I had taken the party all around the islands and we came back to Manila I sent word to Mr. Warren that he might produce any committee that the Filipinos wished to send and present what they thought as to their own power of self-government.

And so they presented a petition August 28, 1905. I can not read it all. It says:

This, to me, Mr. President, is one of the most interesting features of this entire investigation and altogether the most instructive piece of evidence that we have. This is from their brief:

In spite of the unquestionable political capacity of the Filipino people, the result of their present degree of culture and civilization, that they are in a condition of self-government is denied in varying degrees



and forms, though precisely the contrary is demonstrated by facts, experiences, and considerations, among which the following deserve mention:

First. It is an irrefutable fact that the Filipino people are governable; the period of Spanish dominion and of the present American sovereignty bear out this assertion. The political condition of a country principally depends upon the degree of governableness of its people; the more governable the popular classes are the better the political condition of the country.

This was the view of government as presented by the most intelligent of the Filipino people, which, of course, is the old view of the Holy Alliance, which was formed at the close of the Napoleonic wars, the principal tenet of whose creed was that all power came from above and that the people were not entitled to have anything to say with reference to the divine right of government; that a governable people were a people who submitted to the dictation and direction of those who chanced to be in a governing position. It is the old doctrine of the congress of Laybach, that the power to govern comes from above, and that all effort to assert any such right upon the part of the masses should be eliminated, regardless of the method of elimination.

When a people such as the Filipinos gave signal evidence of their capacity to obey during a period of over 300 years, free from disturbance or deep political commotions, it must be granted, considering that all things tend to progress, that they possess the art of government; all the more so because, among other powers, they possess that of assimilation in a marked degree, an assimilableness which distinguishes them from other people of the Far East.

Second. If the masses of the people are governable, a part must necessarily be denominated the directing class, for as in the march of progress, moral or material, nations do not advance at the same rate, some going forward while others fall behind, so it is with the inhabitants of a country, as observation will prove.

Third. If the Philippine Archipelago has a popular governable mass called upon to obey and a directing class charged with the duty of governing, it is in a condition to govern itself.

These factors, not counting incidental ones, are the only two by which to determine the political capacity of a country.

To wit, a governing class and a class willing to be governed—class domination, class control, class direction—and no form of government ever conceived by the human mind is quite so cruel and oppressive as class government.

These factors, not counting incidental ones, are the only two by which to determine the political capacity of a country—an entity that knows how to govern, the directing class, and an entity that knows how to obey, the popular masses.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. BORAH. Certainly.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Will the Senator inform me whose sentiments are those?

Mr. BORAH. Those were the sentiments of some 25 of the most highly educated Filipinos as they presented their theory of self-government to ex-President Taft.

Mr. LIPPITT. Will the Senator state the date of that document?

Mr. BORAH. Nineteen hundred and five.

Mr. LIPPITT. Some 10 or 11 years ago?

Mr. BORAH. Yes; I presume the Senator makes that suggestion upon the theory that such an idea of government could be eliminated in a period of some 10 or 20 years.

Mr. LIPPITT. No, Mr. President; I only wanted to have the exact time, because it was only a few years after we had been in the islands, and I thought it was perhaps only just to the Filipino people that that might be stated and let everybody draw his own inference from it.

Mr. BORAH. What I am seeking to do in bringing the attention of the Senate to this conception of self-government is to emphasize the fact that it comes from a class of people who are more highly educated and better trained in the affairs of government than we would be able to educate and train the masses of the Filipinos in the next fifty or a hundred years. It is to show they have a different standard, a different understanding, and that we not only have to train them to read and write and give them poise and character as a people, but we must reform and change all standards and all conceptions of government.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President—

Mr. BORAH. Just a moment. It is, in other words, Mr. President, a conflict between the old doctrine of the holy alliance and the United States Government in the Philippines, and we will have to stay there, if we do stay, until we uproot and eradicate a thing that is most difficult to uproot and eradicate, and that is the conception of government which has been drilled into the intellect and moral fiber of those people by 300 years of experience. Now I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I was about to ask the Senator if he did not think that the sentiments expressed by the people whom

he has just quoted are sentiments of the class that would do the ruling and governing in the islands if the Filipino people had their independence?

Mr. BORAH. Exactly; I have no doubt of that.

Mr. President, I know that there are a great many very intelligent men in the Philippines, men of great capacity—exceptionally brilliant men some of them are—and in saying anything that I do say I do not, as I have already said, seek to impeach their intelligence or the integrity of character of those men, but we are not dealing with a situation which simply requires us to teach some one how to read or how to speak the English language; we are dealing with a question which requires the unteaching of centuries of schooling. We can not, if I may repeat, ignore the tutelage or the gloomy lessons in government which those people have had for the last 300 years.

The country, as I have said, which held sway over these islands, it will be remembered, was one of those powers which joined the conspiracy at the close of the Napoleonic wars, under the sacrilegious title of the Holy Alliance, the supreme purpose of which was to crush out free government and to root out the spirit of liberty wherever it was possible to exert to that end its sinister and baleful influence. The basic principle of this merciless creed was that the people were by ordinance divine wholly unfit to have a voice in the sacred affairs of government; that all powers of government came from above; and that any manifestation of independence, any expressed purpose to be free upon the part of the governed, were to be stamped out in any conceivable way which a tireless and satanic ingenuity could devise. No member of this conspiracy was more unyielding, more successful in carrying out in all its hideous logic this cruel and fiendish theory. Wherever her inflexible decrees have had sway ignorance and oppression and social degradation have been the immutable lot of the masses. With studied and iniquitous vigilance, with an industry worthy of a noble cause, she punished with rack and thumbscrew, with torture and death, everyone who gave evidence of a longing to enjoy the initiative of sentient beings. Always exacting the last penny which an oppressed peasantry could through unremitting toil grind out, withholding every comfort whose temporary enjoyment might be calculated to reanimate some soul with the desire to be free, she succeeded at last in destroying wholly and completely the initiative, the self-respect, the self-reliance, the hopes, and ambitions of all those from whom we believe the rights of government are derived. She left the hearts and souls of the people as bare and blighted as the miserable hovels in which they lived. It is no ordinary task to unteach these lessons, to reanimate with the aspirations and confidence of a self-helping people these dependents of three long, black, rayless centuries.

It will be a difficult task, a long and arduous task, to implant in the hearts and minds of the masses that initiative, that intelligence, that self-respect and self-reliance indispensable to a self-governing people.

So, Mr. President, we must gird ourselves for this kind of a task: Either to stay there indefinitely—and I say "indefinitely" because I regard 50 or 100 years beyond a point which we ought to discuss independence at all; I regard the task before us such as precludes the discussion of independence or anything like it. We must stay there indefinitely if we are going to help the masses of the Filipino people; and I do not permit myself to be influenced by the intelligent, capable upper class in the Philippines, because they will likely be able to take care of themselves. To state it more appropriately perhaps in the task before us we must first of all consider the interests of the masses.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. BORAH. Yes.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Will the Senator tell us, if he has the information, what proportion of the entire population of the Philippine Islands are of the more intelligent class?

Mr. BORAH. I can not tell the Senator exactly. I am told, however, by those who have been there that it is a very small percentage, but I do not know what it is exactly.

Mr. LIPPITT. If the Senator from Idaho will permit me, there are about 68,000, as I recollect, qualified to vote under the literacy test.

Mr. SHAFROTH. How many?

Mr. LIPPITT. About 68,000.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Oh, no; there are 248,000 who were registered under the test, and 235,000 actually voted.

Mr. LIPPITT. Yes; and of that 235,000 there were about 68,000, if my recollection is correct, who qualified under the literacy qualification. There were other qualifications. I will



turn to the testimony in a minute or two, but I think I am correct.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, in an address delivered by ex-President Taft before the Commonwealth Club of San Francisco, in 1915, he discussed the point the Senator has been making, as to the fact that there was a governing class and a class willing to be governed, and he said:

Thus they were capable of self-government because they had a ruling class of 10 per cent and an obedient class of 90 per cent.

And he went on further to say that a prominent Filipino suggested that they ought to have a third class of Chinamen, who would not be allowed to participate in government, but who would do the work.

Mr. BORAH. In the language of the ex-President, to serve in the capacity of work animals.

Mr. GALLINGER. Work animals; yes.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me just a word further, I quite agree with what the Senator has been saying, that in order that a people may be capable of self-government the masses of the people must understand self-government. It is not sufficient to have a governing class.

I desire to put this question to the Senator: According to the information which we now seem to have, probably not to exceed 10 per cent of the people of the Philippine Islands have sufficient training or sufficient intelligence even to undertake the effort of governing themselves. Suppose that instead of these intelligent Filipinos—who, we must all concede, even though they may be intelligent, have not the capacity of the Anglo-Saxon for self-government—10 per cent of the population were American citizens who were trained and who had inherited through centuries this ability for self-government. Even with a class of that character in these islands, does the Senator believe that it would be possible for those men, let alone the Filipinos, to govern the islands if the strength and power of the United States Government were entirely withdrawn?

Mr. BORAH. No, Mr. President. Even the Anglo-Saxon race has not shown very much greater capacity for proper self-government, where there were only about 10 per cent of them, than any other race. The Anglo-Saxon race has disclosed its great capacity for self-government because of the intelligence and the capacity and the character of the other 90 per cent.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Precisely.

Mr. BORAH. If you had only 10 per cent of Americans in the Philippine Islands, I would not be willing to intrust them with the power of government over the other 90 per cent. The Senator will recall that only this morning in the Judiciary Committee we had an illustration of the remarkable disposition of the Anglo-Saxon race to revert to the power of tyranny and oppression when there were only about 10 per cent of them in the place, and the other 90 per cent were of some other class or of an inferior people. They ignore the Constitution and constitutional provisions, in certain places where we are now governing a large class, almost as much as our cultured friends who have been trained in that kind of class government for the last 300 years.

There is just one safeguard for a free people, and there is no other found among men or upon earth; and that is the education, the character, the intelligence, the initiative, and the poise of the man in the street. There is no class of people who are to be trusted with the power of governing some one else. Abraham Lincoln said that no man is himself free who governs some one else against his will.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for just a minute, to correct a statement which I made a few minutes ago?

Mr. BORAH. Yes, sir.

Mr. LIPPITT. I find, on looking at the record, at page 187, that there were about 90,000 Filipinos who qualified under the educational test. There were others who qualified under the qualification for holding office and under a property qualification.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. BORAH. Just a moment, and then I will yield to the Senator. Does the Senator wish to reply to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Yes. I want to say to the Senator from Rhode Island that he does not take into consideration the fact that the qualification which is imposed on a voter there, outside of the property qualification, consists of his knowing enough to read and write the English language or the Spanish language, neither of which is his own language. Suppose, as a matter of fact, we were to impose here the requirement that no one

in this country could vote unless he were able to speak the Spanish or the French language. How many voters would we have?

It seems to me that is not a fair illustration to test how many people can read and write in the Philippine Islands.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I have made no statement with reference to these points. I merely made a statement as to the number of people who were qualified to vote under a property qualification. Any deductions that may be drawn from that are something entirely outside of my vision. I merely stated the fact.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. The statement made by the Senator just before he was interrupted seems to me so apt and so true that I feel impelled to inform him that some years ago I had the honor of an interview with the late President of Mexico, Porfirio Diaz, and in response to an inquiry which he made of me concerning my impressions of the Mexican Government, I replied that it seemed to me to have been better described by Mr. Lummis as "a republic in chancery" than any other description I had ever seen. I then said that the so-called Republic of Mexico was as radically different from our own, so far as my observation went, as though it were a monarchy. His reply was that no nation can be a self-governing one which does not possess a great, intelligent, patriotic, property-holding class, and that until Mexico had such a class its government would not be that of the United States.

I simply interject that into the Record because it seems to be so apposite with the reflection of the Senator.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, that is quite correct, and I am coming in a few moments to Mexico as an illustration. In taking up Mexico I will say now, in order that there may be no misgivings, that I am not going to discuss it as its history has been written for the last four or five years, but prior to that time, as an illustration of class rule.

I find here, upon page 370, that ex-President Taft says there are about 90 per cent of the people not fit for self-government, but that the 10 per cent of educated Filipinos do not understand self-government. I ought to say in passing here, in order that there may be no misunderstanding, that there is nothing surprising about the fact that the Filipino educated gentleman has an entirely different conception of government than we have. He has been trained in it. He has known nothing else. He has no other view before him. He never has had. It would be a great surprise if we should find that he had any such view as we entertain.

Let me call your attention to an illustration drawn by the ex-President:

One day, while I was governor in the Philippines, a man named Felipe Calderon, one of the leading lawyers in the Philippines, the man who introduced the constitution into the convention at Malolos, came to see me—

Now, here is a constitution maker—

While he was there a poor old Tagalog, who could not speak Spanish, presented a petition to me. My Spanish would make your heart bleed to hear it, even when I was out there, and now it has gone entirely. The petition was in Spanish, and so far as I could figure it out, it contained a recital that his son had been six years in Bilbid Prison; that he had never been tried; and the old man wanted to know what I could do. He had heard that the commission had come there to help out the Filipinos, and he wanted to know if we could not help him.

Well, I turned to Calderon and said to him, "The writ of habeas corpus is in force here. If you will just present a petition for the writ in any of the courts in Manila you can get this man out, if what he says is true."

"Well," said Calderon, "what is a petition for a writ of habeas corpus?"

He had copied the Mexican Constitution and the Federal Constitution and had helped to make up the constitution of Malolos, but he did not have any practical knowledge of those processes which are the Anglo-Saxon palladium of individual right and liberty. And so I drafted for him the form of a petition for a writ of habeas corpus, and he took it into court and he got his man out.

That is called to your attention to direct you again to the thought that the proposition of teaching them to read and write, and of giving them an education, and of spreading that kind of intelligence among the masses is only the first step, a very short step, and may be a very ineffective step, toward self-government.

The task before the American people in the Philippines is to reconstruct the entire conception of government on the part of the intelligent, as well as to train those who are without intelligence; and no more difficult task was ever assumed by anyone. Let me ask the learned Members of this Senate, men versed in history: Will you give me an illustration, from the beginning of time until now, where that task has been achieved with any degree of permanent success? Will you tell me of an instance



in which an intelligent and educated or a self-governing people has ever trained another nationality into their style and capacity of government?

It may be that there is such an example; but I do not know of it, and I have been unable to find it. I do know that there are countless illustrations to the contrary. Therefore, I say that the task before us is not the task of a quarter of a century, nor of half a century. Indeed, sir, if we are to be fair and candid with the Filipino, we must say to him that he is with us for all time, unless we turn him loose now. So far as those now living in the Philippines are concerned, they will never secure independence if they await the completion of the full task which we assume by remaining longer.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. BORAH. I do.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I do not want to interrupt the Senator; but I should like to suggest to him that in those governments where the people have evolved their own civilization and reached a point where no one would question their capacity for maintaining a government of their own, in order to change to our form of government they have almost universally been forced to resort to revolution, and the revolutions have almost universally come from the class of people who Senators maintain upon this floor are incapable of self-government.

Mr. BORAH. All revolutions in government that had any real foundation have started from the masses.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. BORAH. I do.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I entirely agree with what the Senator has said; and I want to cite an instance bearing out the Senator's argument that mere forms of self-government do not constitute self-government; and that, on the contrary, without any forms at all, if the people understand the principles of self-government, they will have it. I refer to the contrast between the man the Senator has described, who drew a free constitution for the Philippine Islands and did not know what the writ of habeas corpus was, and the great, free people of Great Britain, probably as free a people as there are in the world, who have no constitution at all, so far as any written form is concerned.

Mr. BORAH. Exactly.

Mr. President, one more illustration upon this matter and I will pass it over.

It has been said in this debate that there is very little resemblance between the Mexican situation in previous years and that in the Philippines. I find a very strong resemblance.

The Philippines were discovered and brought under control by the same class of explorers as those who overran and conquered Mexico—the same treatment of the natives, the same method of control, the same remorseless rule ensued. I venture to say the same effect and the same deadly virus were the inheritance of both countries from the common master. Allow me to digress here long enough to say I have read a good many pages of history, some bright and some exceptionally black, but I have never read any story of frightfulness anywhere equal to the dismal, monotonous, ruthless, unbroken, and unending story of oppression and injustice in Mexico. In duration and in demoniacal heartlessness, in unvarying fiendishness it has no parallel, so far as I know. Compared with it the cruelties inflicted upon Cuba which called into action the humanitarian spirit of a whole Nation were mild and fleeting. And so far as bringing any relief was concerned, the people of Mexico gained nothing by her independence. It left the same class of rulers—men with the same conception of the rights of the masses, the same venal appetites. It is a pathetic tale, the scene of which lies so close to our door, this effort, this long, futile struggle of the masses to be free, to realize that ever-haunting, half-waking dream of ownership of their lands and their homes; a dream always interrupted at a propitious moment under Empire or Republic alike by that debonair and devilish clique of conspirators, the sole inheritors of Mexico from the mother country.

It is now over a hundred years since the statesman-priest, Miguel Hidalgo, called about him the oppressed, the peons and the slaves, and declared war on their oppressors. From that hour to this the fight has gone on, and in my humble judgment they are no nearer realizing anything like a free or tolerable government to-day than they were 100 years ago. The ruling class as elsewhere at all times talk glibly of free government and practice the most pronounced oppression; profess great con-

cern for the poor yet with unabated vigilance restrain them to the dead level of hopeless serfdom. These rulers have succeeded in their nefarious schemes from year to year and from decade to decade because they have been successful in denying to the masses all opportunity or chance of advancement, in deluding them from time to time with the promise of free homes and free government, but always denying the one and for the other giving them a most cruel, exacting, venal, blood-sucking aristocracy.

In 1856 in Mexico under Juarez—about the one real sympathizing patriot, so far as the masses were concerned, that Mexico ever produced—they wrote a remarkable constitution. I have it upon my desk and had intended to read from it, but I have not the time. It is a remarkable instrument. It divides the government into three parts—the legislative, the executive, and the administrative—and then they wrote a remarkable charter of principles. It was written by Juarez and his supporters, by those who constituted the masses or the governed class. As soon as it was put into effect, and as soon as it began to prevail in Mexico, the governing class conspired to destroy it, and the war between them has been going on from that time until now. Leaders like Juarez could not rely upon the masses. Yet many were able to read. Many were able to write. They could make constitutions. They were of exceptional intelligence for people who had been raised as they were. But the capacity for self-government was utterly a thing apart from the masses of the Mexican people. The result has been that you have had class war in Mexico from that hour until now; and, in my judgment, you will have the same question in the Philippines until those people are not only—if I could use the term properly—reconstructed but rehabilitated in their entire conception of self-government. Will some man tell me within what number of years we could do that?

Mr. LANE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. BORAH. I do.

Mr. LANE. I have listened with a great deal of interest to what the Senator has said, and I have noticed that he bases his argument that the Filipinos will be unable to govern themselves upon the assumption that for the past 300 years they have been saturated with examples of government set them by the Spanish. As a matter of fact, as I have read the history of the Philippine Islands, the Filipino people for 300 years were in revolt against the Spanish rule, and have never accepted it at any time, and never at any time within the 300 years of occupancy of that country by the Spanish people did the Spanish Governor General or any of his suite or any of his functionaries dare go outside of a walled city without danger of losing their lives. The Spanish influence never went beyond the reach of their cannon. The people of the interior of the country were in revolt against them for 300 years continually and constantly, and no Spanish Governor General in 300 years had his scalp safe on his head unless he stayed within or hugged close to a walled city. From within walled cities they tried to rule them, but the rule did not extend far outside of the wall. They did not become accustomed to or receive any inspiration from the Spanish rule. They fought it all down the line for all that time. They are amply prepared, if resistance and repugnance to that kind of a government prepare them, for freedom. They were held in check by the military power of Spain, but never admired or consented to the methods of conducting a government as it was conducted by that country. The lone 10 per cent to whom the distinguished Senator now refers were the people who lived inside of the walled cities, and not those who were free and out in the open country.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I appreciate the suggestion of the Senator from Oregon, because it entirely accentuates the view which I take of this situation. There is a way of saturating a man which is different from applying hot cloths. But this statement that was filed with the ex-President by the learned Filipinos said, as one of the arguments in favor of free government:

When a people such as the Filipinos give signal evidence of their capacity to obey during a period of over 300 years, free from disturbance or deep political commotions, it must be granted, considering that all things tend to progress, that they possess the art of government; all the more so because, among other powers, they possess that of assimilation in a marked degree, an assimilativeness which distinguishes them from other people of the Far East.

I do not think there is any difference between the Senator and myself as to final results.

Now, let us view this preamble just a moment, for I am going to vote for the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE] as a substitute for the preamble and a substitute for the bill, because that is the effect of it. It is a substitute. It is



offered as an amendment, but the effect of it is to constitute it a substitute.

The preamble says:

Whereas it is desirable to place in the hands of the people of the Philippines such an increasing control of their domestic affairs as can be given them without, in the meantime, impairing the sovereignty of the United States, in order that, by the use and exercise of popular franchise and governmental powers, they may be the better prepared to fully assume the responsibilities and enjoy all the privileges of complete independence, which it is the purpose of the United States to grant when, in the judgment of the United States, it will be to the permanent interest of the people of the Philippine Islands.

No impartial tribunal is erected to pass upon that question; but the United States, when in its judgment it shall deem it to the permanent interest of the Filipino people to have independence, is going to grant that independence. To hold a people in subjection when you say to them, "You are practically prepared for independence," when as a matter of fact they are not practically prepared for independence and will not be for long years to come, is, in my judgment, to create disturbance, to breed revolution, to create discontent and dissatisfaction. It is to invite trouble. It is to make real progress in their interest most difficult, if not impossible.

If this bill passes with the preamble in it, within 90 days or six months those people will begin to feel that the time is ripening for their independence; that you could not have been talking about an independence in the far-off years; that it must be something that is practically now within their reach, and that they are practically fitted for it. The effect of the preamble would be to breed discontent among the people of the Philippines if you do not give them their independence within a very reasonable time.

If I am correct in my position that if we stay there for 5 years or 10 years or 15 years or 20 years and then give them their independence they will as a permanent proposition be no better fitted for self-government than they are now, we are going to have all kinds of trouble and difficulty within a very short time by reason of this preamble. They will construe it from their standpoint, and they will insist that they are entitled to have it construed from their standpoint and from what they believe to be their capacity for self-government.

I think it was Mr. Burke, the great English orator and philosopher, who said, in his speech on reconciliation with America, that—

Refined policy ever has been the parent of confusion and ever will be so long as the world endures. Plain, good intentions—

The orator continues—

as easily discovered at first as fraud is sure to be detected at last, is, let me say, no mean force in the government of mankind. A genuine simplicity of heart is a healing and cementing principle.

This is the substance, if not his exact words.

I think of all things in legislation the most important is language which is not susceptible of misconstruction or misunderstanding. It ought to be plain, simple, direct, and positive. We ought not, in my judgment, even to discuss the question of independence with these people at this time if we are going to retain them until indeed they are fit for self-government.

Now, Mr. President, there is one other reason why I am inclined to support this amendment.

Mr. SHAFROTH. In line with the statement the Senator has just made that they would not be fitted for self-government for decades and decades, does he not think that that would lead to insurrection and to revolts among the Filipino people?

Mr. BORAH. Well, if it did, then we are up against this proposition of postponing that insurrection for a day only, because I can not conceive of the United States remaining in the Philippines for any purpose any longer except to educate the Filipino people in self-government. I do not see any other business we have there; I can not see any other reason for our remaining; and it is utterly untenable to my mind to assume that we can do that task or perform that duty inside of decades.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do not understand that it is the purpose of the Senator from Idaho to make any declaration on the subject at all.

Mr. BORAH. Exactly.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The Senator has stated his own view but it is no part of his purpose to insert in this measure such a declaration.

Mr. BORAH. Not at all.

Mr. President, there is one other feature of this question which is in one sense a peculiar one, and still it can not be ignored in this debate. For 17 years one of the great political parties of this country has assumed the position that the Filipino people ought to have their independence. That party is now in power in all the departments of Government. So far as the pledge of an opposite party is concerned it might not

greatly concern me as a citizen of the United States and a member of another party, but we must deal with such questions from a little different viewpoint and at a different range, as it were intellectually, when we come to interpret those pledges in the light of what a dependent people expect and what they have a right to expect now. This campaign has been going on in this country, as I said, for nearly 20 years. In 1900, in 1904, and so on the great party now in power pledged itself to the giving of these people independence when they should come into power. There was no misunderstanding as to the meaning of that pledge in the campaigns. We may refine upon it here in the Senate Chamber, but the people of the United States understood it, and if the people of the United States understood it you may be assured that the Filipino people interpreted it even more strongly in favor of independence.

I will take a moment to recall those pledges, because they do not admit, in my judgment, of misconstruction, and are not to be ignored in the full and fair discharge of our duty:

We condemn the experiment in imperialism as an inexcusable blunder, which has involved us in enormous expenses, brought us weakness instead of strength, and laid our Nation open to the charge of abandoning a fundamental doctrine of self-government. We favor an immediate declaration—

This was in 1908—

of the Nation's purpose to recognize the independence of the Philippine Islands as soon as a stable government can be established, such independence to be guaranteed by us as we guarantee the independence of Cuba, until the neutralization of the islands can be secured by treaty with other powers. In recognizing the independence of the Philippines our Government should retain such land as may be necessary for coaling stations and naval bases.

It has been said here that that did not necessarily mean that the Filipino people were capable of self-government; that it might take some time. I refer to a speech by Mr. Bryan, made many years ago—and certainly the Filipinos are no less fit for self-government now than they were then—in which he said:

We are told that the Filipinos are not capable of self-government. That has a familiar ring. Only two years ago I heard the same argument made against a very respectable minority of the people of this country. \* \* \* Self-government is a constant education; the capacity for self-government increases with participation in government. The Filipinos are not far enough advanced to share in the government of the people of the United States, but they are competent to govern themselves.

\* \* \* \* \*  
Give the Filipinos time and opportunity, and while they never will catch up with us, unless we cease to improve, yet they may some day stand where we stand now—

And so forth.

I could quote to any extent from similar sentiments made by not only the distinguished leader of the party at that time, and possessing some influence in his party still, I suspect, but other distinguished leaders of the party, to the effect that the declaration in the platform meant precisely what it said—that the Filipino people were fit for self-government and were entitled to complete independence. Now, that pledge has been in existence upon the part of this party for the last 17 or 20 years.

As I said, that party is now in power. For one, I am not going to stand in the way of a fulfillment of that pledge because it does not relate to me, as some of the platform pledges might as a citizen of the United States, but it is a pledge by this Government, as it is now controlled, to a dependent people.

Mr. Moorfield Storey, in interpreting this platform, said a few days ago:

Upon these statements of policy and these promises the Democratic Party has sought the support of the voters, and it has now received that support and is in full control of the Government. If words mean anything, it has promised to give the Filipinos their independence, and no man can trust it if this promise is broken. Why should any Democrat suggest that the policy which his party has so uniformly and so repeatedly pledged itself to adopt be now abandoned and the Republican policy which it has "condemned and denounced," which it has characterized as "an indefinite, irresponsible, discretionary, and vague absolutism," which it has called "an inexcusable blunder," be now adopted or by delay continued in operation?

That is a construction placed on the platform by one of the most intelligent and one of the ablest Democrats in the country. Now, what interpretation naturally have the Filipino people placed upon it, and if it is not carried out—if that pledge is not fulfilled—in what condition of mind does it leave the Filipino people in the Philippines?

In my judgment, Mr. President, we can not ignore those pledges as we might as Republicans if they were dealing with matters which related solely and wholly to our own country.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, does the Senator from Idaho think that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas is a redemption of this pledge, which, as I understand him, is that the Filipinos shall be given immediate independence?

I call the attention of the Senator from Idaho to the fact that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas pro-



poses to give the Filipinos independence, perhaps, because it has a proviso which reads:

That if the President, at the expiration of the said period of four years, shall find that the condition of the internal or external affairs of said Philippines in respect to the stability or efficiency of the proposed government thereof is such as to warrant him in so doing, he is hereby further authorized, by proclamation duly made and published, to extend the said time to and including the date of the final adjournment of the session of Congress which shall convene next after the date of the expiration of the said period of four years, and thus afford the Congress an opportunity in its discretion to further consider the situation in the said Philippines.

So this extends independence with a string to it, which may be pulled back.

Mr. BORAH. It also provides that it shall go into effect unless Congress affirmatively rescinds or repeals this act.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Which Congress may very well do.

Mr. BORAH. Congress may very well do it, Mr. President. I am aware that it is an easy thing to pass resolutions in a political convention. I am also aware that to withdraw sovereignty where it has once obtained or to take the flag out of the sky with which it has become familiar is about the most difficult and tantalizing task that a people can undertake to perform. It is a very difficult thing to withdraw sovereignty.

I have no doubt that the Senator from Arkansas in offering this amendment had to accommodate himself to a situation and that there were those who were not willing to let the Filipinos go to-morrow or the next day, and, indeed, I presume, too, that it would be unwise, until the transfer of government could be made complete and efficient and effective, to do so; but it is a decided step, and in brief will be a conclusive step.

There is one thing that will be certain, and I think the Senator from Utah will agree with me. If that is passed, in at least five years from now those people will be free.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do not think that would follow at all.

Mr. BORAH. I think it does, for this reason: I have no fear in the world of Congress ever repealing this law if we start upon the proposition of independence.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The proviso that I have already read provides that the President may extend the time if, in his judgment, it appears that the conditions as to the stability or efficiency of the proposed government are such as to justify him in doing it. Of course if the conditions in that respect are such as to justify the President in extending the time, the language of the proviso, it seems to me, very clearly indicates that they will be sufficient to justify Congress in making some other disposition; and Congress may indefinitely extend the time or repeal the law altogether. It is not a hard and fast piece of legislation.

Mr. BORAH. No.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. As I said, it is independence with a string to it.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I should like to suggest to the Senator that if the date fixed in an act were absolute, four or five years from now, there would be a right in Congress to repeal the act. You can not make a legislative act which can not be repealed. Considering the exigencies that might arise, considering that we might be in a state of war at the time, it seems to me it would be very appropriate for the President to have the power to extend the time for a year, or even to extend it longer.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Then, if the Senator from Idaho will permit me, let me ask the Senator from Colorado, if the effect of the legislation is the same whether it contains this proviso or not, why put in the proviso?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Oh, no; it is not the same.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I thought not.

Mr. SHAFROTH. No; it is not the same; but I believe, and I think the Senator believes, if this is passed, as the Senator from Idaho has said, it will end our jurisdiction over there within five years, not that Congress could not vote under that proviso to extend the time—it could extend the time under any statement that might be made—but a pledge made by Congress is not likely ever to be violated by either a subsequent Congress or by the people of the United States.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. What the Senator from Colorado says is true—that if the proviso was not here at all Congress would still have the power to repeal the legislation. There is not any doubt about that. But the difference would be that in the one case there would be a positive, absolute piece of legislation the terms of which Congress would have to violate if it repealed the law, whereas with the proviso in there is not any violation of the terms, because Congress will have reserved the right. It is precisely the thing we do very often in legislation which affects the rights of private individuals. We grant a right to construct a bridge, or something of that sort, and we give the grantee warning by putting in the legislation a pro-

vision that this law may be repealed or altered or amended by Congress at any time. We warn him in advance what we may do. It is not because it adds to the power of Congress, but we put it in as an express admonition that we are reserving our right to do that, instead of giving the understanding that the law is unalterable and irrevocable.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Will the Senator from Idaho permit me a suggestion?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. VARDAMAN. If Congress should pass a law at this session giving the Filipinos their independence in four years, a subsequent Congress could repeal that. There is another point to which I wish to call the Senator's attention. If this amendment is ever written upon the statute books it goes to the people of America for their approval or disapproval, and no political party in power, in my judgment, will come back here four years hence instructed to undo the work.

Mr. LIPPITT. If the Senator from Idaho will allow me, Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND], who seems to think the bill provides some method of extending the four-year term, if he has read the language in the bill which provides that in not more than four years independence shall be granted to the Philippine Islands. If that four years began on the 1st day of February, at 12 o'clock, it would compel the President of the United States four years from the 1st day of next February, at 12 o'clock, or at some time prior to that date to grant independence.

The bill then goes on to say that at the expiration of the period of four years—that is, at 12 o'clock four years from the 1st day of next February—after their independence has been granted under the terms of the bill, the President may consult Congress as to whether or not he shall continue the administration in the islands.

I will confess that under the conditions described in the language of the bill I am unable to see how it could be fulfilled. The bill provides that independence shall be granted before the time at which the President is allowed to consider whether or not it ought to be granted. The Senator from Idaho may want to vote for that provision.

Mr. BORAH. I do not think the view of the Senator is a correct view.

Mr. LIPPITT. I would be glad to have the Senator from Utah explain that provision if he is able.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I appreciate the great anxiety of the Senator from Rhode Island to have the views of the Senator from Utah, but really I would like to conclude and then let them enlighten one another later.

Mr. COLT. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. BORAH. I do.

Mr. COLT. I should like to ask the Senator how he reconciles his position of granting independence to the Filipinos with the other position which he has elucidated so ably that the people are not capable at the present time of establishing a stable form of government. If the people are not able at the present time to establish a stable form of government, does not the Government of the United States owe to them a duty which it does not fulfill by granting them independence now and thus setting them adrift before they are capable of maintaining any form of stable government?

Mr. BORAH. May I ask the Senator a question in order to enable me to answer him more intelligently. How long does the Senator think, in view of the speech which he made this afternoon, it will take us to educate those people for self-government?

Mr. COLT. I have no idea how long it will take; and if the Senator presses me further upon that question I would say that I think we are bound to continue the same policy with the Filipino people which we have continued for 15 years, and that I would so treat the Filipino people in the future that at the time they might demand their independence they would then feel under such obligation to us that they would not desire their independence any more than Canada desires its independence from Great Britain to-day.

I can not forecast the future, but I do feel that we have a sacred duty to fulfill to these people who have been under our charge for more than 15 years, and to my mind it would be unbecoming this great Government now to set them adrift. Let us be consistent and not hesitate to fulfill the high duty and responsibility which has fallen upon us as a great power.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, it is very difficult to secure from even so eminent a jurist and so profound a student of his-

tory as the Senator from Rhode Island any suggestion at all as to how long it would take us to perform the task which he says it is our duty to perform.

I would agree with the Senator that there has arisen a certain moral obligation upon the part of this Government toward the Filipino people, but I am just as thoroughly convinced of the proposition as I would be of any other that could be possibly presented to my mind, that we are not going to remain in the Philippines long enough to teach them the capacity or the art of self-government, and that when you vote down the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas you vote to retain permanently the Philippine Islands.

So there are two questions here—first, whether you are going to retain the Philippine Islands permanently or, second, whether you are going to release them within a reasonable time, within such time as they can take into their hands the reins of government and assume jurisdiction over the islands.

Mr. COLT. May I ask the Senator whether we should take any action at this particular time? Why make any such declaration as is set forth in the Clarke amendment? Why not pass the bill which the committee has reported and let the matter rest there for the present?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I have been seeking to explain during the afternoon why I think it is unwise to pass the bill as it is, because it promises independence, when at the same time we know that not within this generation or the succeeding generation will they be fit for self-government. I think that is eminently unwise legislation, but I think it foreshadows beyond a question what ultimately we are going to do, and that is to turn the Filipino people over to themselves or to their form of government within a time in which they will not be any better fitted for self-government than they are now.

Originally, Mr. President, I viewed this situation just as the former Senator from Massachusetts, Senator Hoar, and others did, that we ought not to have gone into the Philippine Islands at all. After we had gone into the islands and assumed certain obligations I became convinced that a moral obligation had arisen and we owed the Filipino people some duty, and we ought to perform that duty.

I have since become convinced, however, just as certainly, that under the political situation as it prevails from time to time in the United States this is going to be a political question until it is settled, and so long as it is a political question we will never teach the people of the Philippines that capacity for self-government which will enable them to deal with the question as we deal with self-government. It will be a political question in the United States, and party prejudices will be constantly changing policies in the Philippines.

I will call your attention to one who has studied this question as profoundly as any man in the United States, and who was originally as much in earnest with reference to holding the Philippines as any other man in the United States, who has defended the United States in its action upon the Philippines as effectively as any other man, and that is ex-Senator Root, where he says:

If things are to be done in that way—

That is, if the Philippine question is always to be a political question—and it always will be a political question—we had better give the islands their independence promptly: not promise it in the future, but give notice of an election and turn it over as we did with Cuba.

Undoubtedly the former Senator from New York has come to the conclusion that we are going to get out of the Philippine Islands before we shall have fully done that which he thought ought to have been achieved before we left the islands. He feels that under the conditions which are to prevail by reason of playing politics we ought to leave now.

That position, Mr. President, is the position which I assume in regard to the Clarke amendment. I am quite aware that it does not turn it over, as Senator Root says in his letter, but it takes the step which, in my judgment, will likely never be retraced.

In conclusion, it is my purpose to vote for the Clarke amendment, which, as I have stated, is in effect a substitute for the bill. I do so because, in the first place, I entertain no doubt that it is a wiser course than that outlined in the bill proper, carrying, as it does, this preamble.

I do so for the further reason that this Philippine question has been for 20 years a political question, more so now in a practical way than ever before. It seems clear that it is always to be a football of party politics, that a dependent people are to be tossed about by the vicissitudes of party interest. That being true, it is utterly impossible to perform adequately the great task before us in the Philippines. We are doing what we are

doing at a tremendous risk, and as failure under these conditions seems certain I prefer to withdraw our sovereignty now.

There are other and controlling reasons which I have indicated in my remarks, but which I will not recapitulate. If we could have gone on as we started, keeping strictly to the task of teaching these people the art of free government and the principles of a higher civilization, withholding all promise of independence until we should approach something near the time of its fruition I would have been willing to remain longer. Indeed, if I thought we would stay until in a true sense this experiment had been fully tested I would have been willing to stay. But this bill and the sentiment behind it leads me inevitably to the policy outlined by the Clarke amendment. Of the two policies I think it preferable.

Mr. THOMAS obtained the floor.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the Senator, not controversial at all but to get his opinion. Why should the pending question dealing with the disposition of the Philippine Islands be a political or a party question? What is there about it that it should take on that attitude?

Mr. BORAH. Of course, theoretically, the Senator's inferences are quite correctly taken. It should not be a political question. But the Senator, of course, knows quite as well as I know that it is a political question, both here and in the Philippines.

Mr. STONE. Then does the Senator mean that one of the great political parties will favor the granting of independence to the Philippines in some form and that another one of the great political parties will oppose it?

Mr. BORAH. That has been the exact situation, I believe, for the last 17 years—the Republicans believing that the time was not yet at hand to promise independence.

Mr. STONE. Really I did not know that it had been a political or party question. To my thinking it ought to be so far removed from the field of party politics that I have not discovered that it was really a party question. I feel that Senators on a question of this kind ought to vote their opinion as to what is best for the country without any reference to party questions. If I am mistaken about it, and one party favors independence and the other is opposed to it, then am I to understand that the Democratic Party favors granting independence; and if it does that, the Republican Party is opposed to granting independence to the Filipino people?

I wanted to get near to an exact issue if possible, if there be such an issue, which I hoped there was not, and I have been inclined to believe that there was not.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator from Missouri looks entirely serious. There is an outward calm that is interesting.

Mr. STONE. And I am serious.

Mr. BORAH. But one of the most vital political questions that we have had in this country during one campaign, and incidentally important in all other campaigns, is the attitude of the two parties with reference to the Philippines. The Democratic Party pledged itself to independence.

Mr. STONE. That was 15 years ago.

Mr. BORAH. And ever since. You repeated it in the last platform. You say in the Democratic platform that you reassert and reavow all the things which you have said for the last 15 years with reference to the Philippines, and that you are in favor of carrying out the program, as you term it, and that, if put in power, you will do so. Here is the platform—

Mr. STONE. I am familiar with the platform. I know the attitude of the Democratic Party on the subject; but what is the attitude of the Republican Party?

Mr. BORAH. The attitude of the Republican Party was that we ought to stay in the Philippines until we enabled the Filipinos to exercise the art of self-government.

Mr. STONE. And the Senator from Idaho thinks that that may be 300 or 400 years.

Mr. BORAH. I am not at all averse to saying, Mr. President, I am not ashamed to say in the presence of this distinguished body, and I am not afraid to say in the face of history, that the Filipino people will not be fitted for self-government, upon any standard which has ever prevailed in a free government, inside of 200 years.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

Mr. BORAH. Wait just a moment. The Senator from Missouri is a historian; he challenged me upon that point the other day; and I now ask him to point me to a single instance where a people have ever acquired the art or capacity for self-government inside of 500 years?

Mr. STONE. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS. I understand I was recognized a few moments ago.



The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Colorado was recognized.

Mr. THOMAS. I have no desire to take the floor if the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] has not yielded.

Mr. BORAH. I am going to yield now.

Mr. STONE. I undertook to interrupt the Senator from Idaho for a moment.

Mr. BORAH. I had intended to sit down, but the Senator from Missouri wanted to be enlightened as to the Democratic platform.

Mr. THOMAS. I wanted to ascertain my status on the floor.

Mr. STONE. I particularly wish to be enlightened as to the Republican attitude. You can never tell anything about a Republican platform; that goes as a matter of course. The Senator from Idaho asked me—

Mr. BORAH. Now, let us not discuss party platforms this afternoon, because that is an engaging subject.

Mr. STONE. Yes; and I will not do so, although the Senator from Idaho has provoked it.

There is a modern instance—a very recent instance—where I think the people concerned were no better qualified than are the Filipinos for self-government. I refer to Cuba.

Mr. BORAH. Well, Mr. President, permit me merely to say that if you withdraw the protectorate of the United States from Cuba and take the lid off in Cuba you will see what kind of a self-government they have got there at this hour.

Mr. STONE. We have not any pretense of self-government in the Philippine Islands.

Mr. BORAH. Oh, of course, an infant may walk so long as somebody holds him up, but—I do not say this disrespectfully—it is wholly misleading to assume for a moment that the Cuban people are trained now in the art of self-government.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I wish merely to say that there is, of course, no pretense of an independent self-government, or anything approximating it, in the Philippine Islands at this time. We are governing the Philippines; we make the laws for them; we supply them with American officials, and all that. So far as the Cuban people are concerned, it may be that the Senator's conjectures as to what might happen in certain contingencies might prove true.

Mr. THOMAS. I yield the floor, Mr. President.

Mr. STONE. Very well. Mr. President, I did not know that the Senator from Colorado had the floor. I rose to make an inquiry of the Senator from Idaho before he took his seat, and he yielded to me before he did take his seat, but since the Senator from Colorado resents it—

Mr. THOMAS. I am perfectly good-natured about it. I simply was tired of "watchfully waiting." [Laughter.]

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I will not interrupt the Senator further.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Chair has anything to do with it, he will now recognize the Senator from Washington.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] asked the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] what the Republican platform says on this question. I happened to have the platform in my hand, and thought it would be appropriate to call attention to the platform of the Republican Party as in issue with the platform of the Democratic Party on that question in 1900. The Senator says he did not understand this was a party question, and yet in 1900 it was really the paramount issue of the campaign. I asked the Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH] to corroborate my recollection of that the other day, and I think he agreed with me that Mr. Bryan, as the candidate of the Democratic Party, made that what he called "the paramount issue."

Mr. SHAFROTH. I will state that I said that Mr. Bryan tried to make that question the paramount issue, but that the newspapers of New York would not let it be done, because they wanted the financial interests to become the paramount issue. I have no doubt they carried the eastern part of the country on the financial plank in the platform.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Well, Mr. Bryan, as the nominee of his party, did the best he could to make it the paramount issue, and consequently it was the issue. The Republican platform of 1900 said:

In accepting by the treaty of Paris the just responsibility of our victories in the Spanish War, the President and the Senate won the undoubted approval of the American people. No other course was possible than to destroy Spain's sovereignty throughout the West Indies and in the Philippine Islands. That course created our responsibility before the world and with the unorganized population whom our intervention had freed from Spain to provide for the maintenance of law and order and for the establishment of good government and for the performance of international obligations.

Our authority could not be less than our responsibility, and wherever sovereign rights were extended it became the high duty of the Government to maintain its authority to put down armed insurrection and to confer the blessings of liberty and civilization upon all the rescued peoples.

The largest measure of self-government consistent with their welfare and our duties shall be secured to them by law.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, before the Senator from Washington takes his seat, I wish to ask him a question. It seems that for the enlightenment of the American people the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is to be filled up with platform promises on this question. I want to ask the Senator if the Bull Moose Party has not very recently spoken on the question?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I do not think so, Mr. President.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I understand that he has, and that he has declared in favor of getting out of the Philippines.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The platform of the Progressive Party contained no such declaration.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. LIPPITT. I should like to ask the Senator from Idaho if he will not publish—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair must insist that some little decent respect shall be shown to the Chair. The Chair recognized the Senator from Colorado. Does he yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. LIPPITT. I simply want to ask the Senator from Idaho a question, if the Senator from Colorado will permit me to do so.

Mr. THOMAS. I yield, of course, but I hope the Senator's question will not open up another long debate.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, with the permission of the Senator from Colorado, I simply desire to ask the Senator from Idaho, in connection with his quotation from Mr. Root, if he will not have published the entire letter of which the quotation was a part, so that it can be made plain just what Mr. Root's position is on that question?

Mr. BORAH. I have no objection to have published in my speech anything that Mr. Root may say upon any subject.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I have listened with close attention to the remarks of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] upon the pending bill, whose every utterance meets my hearty approval. I do not think it is possible for one people to educate another people to its standard of efficiency either in self-government or in any other sort of government. They may, of course, transmit many of their experiences and they may make a profound impression upon the governmental theories of the subject people; but the spirit of nationality, to which the Senator from Idaho so eloquently referred, is one which embraces, and which I think is inseparable from, those ideas of government which are peculiar to it and which have been evolved either through stages of barbarism or civilization, or both, into the standard which appeals to it, and which is also best and most adaptable to its needs.

I do not believe that if the United States retained the Philippine Islands forever for the sole purpose of educating the Filipinos into the capacity for self-government—and we do not pretend to retain them for any other—that such purpose would be accomplished; that is, from the standpoint of Anglo-Saxon ideals of self-government; nor do I believe that it could do so in any given time or indefinitely, nor that any duty has devolved upon us to do it, or that we should do it at all.

If I understand the attitude of some of the opponents of this measure, of which the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COIT] is a distinguished exponent, it is that out of our occupation and possession of the Philippine Islands has been evolved a duty—a solemn, unavoidable duty—resting upon the shoulders of the American people requiring them to transmit, before their protectorate shall be ended, no matter how long it may take, to the people of the Philippine Islands its own institutions, its own ideas of government, its own bases of society, its own methods of civilization; then it should turn them adrift, because they will then be perfectly able to take care of themselves.

Mr. President, I know of no recorded instance in history where anything of that kind ever took place, and I am confident that nothing of the kind ever did or ever will take place. The Senator, perfectly candid, as he always is, when face to face with the results of his doctrine, not only virtually concedes that that period of time will never come, but asserts that we should continue the policy in the hope that it would so far educate them as to destroy their sense or desire of self-government and make them so content with their lot that, like Canada, they will prefer their subjection to their independ-



ence; from which I infer that the Senator, recognizing the impossibility of the performance of the duty whose existence he asserts would continue the attempt to perform it until its purpose was visibly impossible of accomplishment, not only to the teacher but to the taught. By that time the old process of benevolent assimilation would have become effective, and the Filipinos, solely dependent upon us, would have lost their desire for liberty in their enjoyment of our mild and elevating overlordship.

Mr. President, I think that there is a duty which we owed to the Philippines when the Spanish War was ended; I think we still owe it to them; and I regret very much that we did not recognize and perform it away back in 1899 and 1900, as we should have done. It was pictured on this floor by the great Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. Hoar, in one of the greatest orations that ever fell from human lips, filled with warnings not only as to the effect of our proposed policy on the Filipinos but upon our own institutions. The same note of warning was sounded at the other end of this building by the great Speaker of the House of Representatives, Mr. Reed. A former Senator from Vermont, still living I believe, used his pen in vigorous protest against what seemed to be to him a threatened violation of American principles, and a former Speaker of the House of Representatives, Mr. John G. Carlisle, in one of the most statesmanlike articles ever written, published, I think, in Harper's Monthly of September, 1899, pointed to the inevitable fact that we were about to embark upon a policy which would surely transform our traditional policy, violate the underlying principle of our institutions, and enter upon a career of colonization with the avowed object of what was then popularly known as "benevolent assimilation," whose results no man could foresee beyond the certainty of national misfortune. But the Nation was deaf to these appeals. We did not regard our duty then, Mr. President; we waved it aside and bought the Filipinos for \$2 apiece, paying \$20,000,000 for them and for their islands; we took forcible possession of them at once and have held them ever since, under the protest of a great portion of the American people and under a sort of common consent that at some time in the remote future we would withdraw from them and let them work out their own destiny.

I do not believe there is much difference between any of those who have considered the subject, whatever their political affiliations may be, about the general proposition that we should not remain indefinitely in the islands.

The difference is between those who would fix a definite time for leaving them and those who contend that it is impossible to fix a time because of the difficulty of performing the task which our duty has placed upon us within any specific period. That is ostensibly the difference; the real difference is, Mr. President, that some of us think we should get out of the islands as soon as we can, while others do not propose to get out of there at all, since they can very easily assign an indefinite time for final action, to be measured by our opinion of the capacity of the people for self-government, and then, as we are the judges as to when that time arrives, we can and will postpone it forever. We will thus remain in the Orient, albeit we protest that we have neither the desire nor the intention of doing so.

Mr. President, the real duty imposed upon the American people by our occupation of the islands is to me an obvious one. It has not been accomplished. It was evolved from the act of our occupation, and has continued and will continue until we perform it. That duty is to leave the islands as soon as we can do so decently, as soon as we can do so safely, as soon as we can do so with due regard to an avoidance of those disturbances which are inseparable from putting the change into effectual operation.

Mr. President, if there is a doctrine which may be said to contain a national policy for America it is what is popularly known as the Monroe doctrine, announced nearly a century ago, since which time it has received the unanimous and sometimes the overenthusiastic support of all the American people. It is familiar to all, and therefore not necessary that I should repeat it; I recall, however, that when the proposition was submitted to Mr. Jefferson he wrote Mr. Madison giving it his unqualified adherence, yet emphasized the corollary of the proposition; that America should avoid all entangling alliances abroad, keep her hands off the affairs of the Eastern Hemisphere, refrain from participation in European affairs, and confine her political activities to the western world; in other words, the doctrine involved mutuality of conduct and consistency of action whereby, as a consideration of our insistence upon its observance, we should restrict ourselves to our own and the affairs of our own hemisphere. But when the Philippines were taken over, Mr. President, we established an outpost 10,000 miles from

our mainland, away off in the Orient, and by that act struck our own great Monroe doctrine a blow in the face. We repudiated our own policy, placed ourselves in direct antagonism with its principle, and gave the nations of Europe warrant for believing that our hunger for land had overcome our previous declaration of a doctrine whose adoption was essential to our freedom and with what seemed to be our manifest destiny.

It must never be forgotten that we owe duties, Mr. President, to ourselves quite as strong, and to my mind far stronger and more insistent, than any which have been imposed upon us with regard to the Philippines by reason of the relations which we voluntarily assumed and have occupied toward that country during the past 15 or 16 years. One of them, and perhaps the most important, is to so conduct our relations with other countries and other lands as to make our national policy of "hands off the American Continent" effective at all times.

What is one of the results, or one of the apparent results, of this policy of annexation? The so-called Clarke amendment provides—and, indeed, I think, it may be essential—that when the Philippine Islands are turned over to their own people, we shall seek to effectuate by treaty arrangement with other governments such provisions for their safety, their autonomy, and their neutralization as may be essential to their welfare; in other words, the duty which we have assumed, the obligation which we have imposed upon ourselves is not so much the attempt to educate the people of the Philippines to the impossible, as it is to make arrangements, possibly entangling alliances with other nations, for the betterment and welfare of a people with whom we should never have had any relations whatever. Where these treaties may lead us no man knoweth. But we do know that they are the outgrowth of our disregard of a national policy, whose overshadowing importance to ourselves has been the theme of every statesman and diplomatist since 1823. Yes; we must make alliances forsooth with other nations for the protection of an Asiatic people with whom we have nothing in common, whom we secured at the behest of commercialism rather than from any concern for their so-called civilization.

Mr. President, we hear a good deal in these exciting times about the need of preparation for national defense. The imagination of many good men and women easily pictures the menace of foreign invasion; the air and the sea and the land seem to them to be peopled with specters of danger ever approaching from every side, the more apprehensive because they are unreal and indefinite, yet many of those who really entertain the view that our alleged defenseless condition makes us a tempting victim to any of the great powers of the world are among those who would keep the Philippines indefinitely, either as a subject Province or as an outlying colony, which may become fitted through the exigencies of industry and of politics for admission to statehood. They insist upon keeping a land thousands of miles away from our coast, which is unprotected and undefended, and which therefore offers to any nation which may design to enter into a conflict with the American people the most tempting opportunity to begin hostilities, where it would be practically impossible for us to promptly meet and overcome it. Of course, an attack of that sort, Mr. President, arousing the national indignation and appealing to the national pride, would inevitably plunge us into a war, which perhaps never would have arisen but for the opportunity given to bring it on through the existence of these conditions which this bill, I think, would put an end to. In other words, Mr. President, the Philippines are a source of national danger. I think that the suggestion made by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN] to the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] a few moments ago of the attitude of ex-President Roosevelt concerning the problem is correct, if I have been properly informed as to what he has recently said about it.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I am not fully informed as to the attitude of ex-President Roosevelt on the question. That, however, was not the question that was asked me by the Senator from Mississippi. He asked me as to the declaration of the Progressive Party platform on the question.

Mr. THOMAS. I understood the Senator from Mississippi to ask the Senator from Washington if the great leader of the late so-called Bull Moose Party had not recently announced himself in favor of an abandonment of the Philippine Islands. I may have been mistaken.

Mr. VARDAMAN. No; the question—

Mr. POINDEXTER. I think I heard the Senator from Mississippi distinctly. On the contrary, he asked me if the platform of that party had not so declared, and I informed him that it had not.



Mr. VARDAMAN. No; I asked the Senator, in a facetious spirit, if the Bull Moose Party had not recently declared in favor of releasing the Philippine Islands.

Mr. POINDEXTER. They have not. That was the question, as I understood it.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Then I said to the Senator that I understood that "he" had. [Laughter.]

Mr. POINDEXTER. I did not catch the latter remark. I merely want to say that the attitude of Mr. Roosevelt was discussed here the other day, and a quotation from some of his utterances was made to show that he had been in favor of declaring to the Filipinos that we would give them their independence as soon as they were capable of self-government, but that construction of his utterance was disputed here, and I do not think that it was susceptible of that construction myself.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I do not care, of course, to raise the question whether or not my information was correct. I think, however, that the opinion of the late leader of the Bull Moose Party is much more important than the expression of the opinion of that party, which is now but a passing memory.

My understanding, however, is that the very point which I was just seeking to emphasize had impressed itself upon Col. Roosevelt, within the last four or five months at least, so strongly and so powerfully that, recognizing the danger involved in our exposed position away out across the seas, he suggested that it would be well to get rid of them, and get rid of them as soon as possible, especially, Mr. President, in view of the fact, as was well said by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], that the party now in power, having constantly promised to do this thing, could accomplish the purpose. Of course I do not pretend to quote the utterances of the ex-President.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I should like to give the exact quotation.

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SHAFROTH. It was in Everybody's Magazine of January, 1915, in which Col. Roosevelt said:

If we act so that the natives understand us to have made a definite promise, then we should live up to that promise. The Philippines from a military standpoint are a source of weakness to us. The present administration has promised explicitly to let them go, and by its actions has rendered it difficult to hold them against any serious foreign foe. These being the circumstances, the islands should at an early moment be given their independence without any guaranty whatever by us and without our retaining any foothold in them.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, for once I am in perfect accord with the ex-President of the United States.

Now, Mr. President, I want for a moment to refer to the argument which is based upon the proposition that we should hold the Philippines until they are capable of self-government, which means, of course, that we must hold them until we think they have been educated up to our standard of political efficiency.

I contend that no nation has any right, that no nation can lawfully and justly acquire any right, to pass judgment upon the capacity of any other nation for self-government. It is none of our business whether the people of the Philippines are capacitated for self-government or not; and if we assume to judge, that judgment when tested by experience may prove to be worthless and erroneous.

Moreover, I deny that one people has the power to confer freedom and independence upon another, except by removing them from every constraint of overlordism. That is not the way in which freedom has been acquired by any people at any time in the history of mankind. Freedom, liberty, self-governing institutions have been won by the peoples who have enjoyed them by their struggles, their sufferings, and their sacrifices. One of the greatest Senators—Mr. Toombs, of Georgia—who ever occupied a seat in this body said, more than half a century ago:

Liberty and freedom are the virtues of those who have acquired and fought for them without ceasing, and no nation can long retain them which is not at all times ready to die for them.

That is the test. If we are to keep these people in leading strings, the very fact will deprive them of that resourcefulness, that self-reliance, that experience which comes from hard knocks in government as well as in life, which is not only the test of character, but which develops it both individually and as a nation. The longer we hold these people, the longer one people hold any other in leading strings—provided, of course, their control is effective—the more remote is the possibility of self-government being developed among them.

And I want to say, Mr. President, that I am not much concerned whether the Filipinos, when they are given their freedom, as we call it, can or will govern themselves or not. I think we should be much more concerned in the reflex action and influence of our attitude concerning the Philippines upon our own institutions and upon the national character than we are in trying

to educate them up to our own standards of self-government and then setting them adrift when we conclude that our task has been accomplished. They will ultimately have that government which comes from the evolution of tests and experience among themselves, and that will be the one to which they are entitled and for which they are adapted.

For my part, I do not care whether that ultimate government is a republic, a monarchy, or some other sort of a government. I am satisfied that it will be that which their experience ultimately develops, through a process of evolution and possibly revolution; and it is bound to be, in the last analysis, the one best fitted for them. They have a right to govern themselves in that way, if they see fit to do so, without any superposition upon them of our ideas, of our notions, or of our instructions, always, of course, giving them the benefit of the educational system which has been so effective up to this time, and has been the one redeeming feature of our occupation of the islands.

Government? Why, Mr. President, I think it was Plato who said of all governments that in their last analysis they were always the government of the strongest men. Even in our own form of government it is the strong men who dominate, and who, by impressing their personality and influence and leadership upon the machinery of government, make it effective or direct it for better or for worse.

So, as far as the future is concerned, while, of course, we may be largely interested in the results of our tutelage of those people, nevertheless the duty before us is one which we owe to ourselves, and it imperatively requires that we get rid of a subject people as soon as possible.

I was much taken some time ago with a reflection of the English historian, Mr. Froude. It is appropriate to the discussion. He said:

If there be one lesson which history clearly teaches, it is that free nations can not govern subject provinces. If they are unable or unwilling to admit their dependencies to their own constitution, the constitution itself will fall in pieces from mere incompetence for its duties.

No more obvious truth was ever uttered.

These people, Mr. President, if we retain them, must become citizens, they must be admitted to our Constitution or the latter must fall because incompetent to discharge its functions. There can be no subjects in a republic. When he appears the republic becomes but a name. There can be, in a free republic, no subjects without doing violence to our institutions. They must be citizens if they stay; and those who oppose their independence must admit this or recognize a purpose of colonization. The present Speaker of the House of Representatives some time ago declared that the longer we continue to occupy these islands the greater the danger that politics may develop a situation which will ultimately lead to their admission as States of the Union. It is not, of course, improbable—indeed, it may be very likely—that if our constant occupation of these islands should lead to such a result the votes cast by an alien people 10,000 miles away might determine an election of a President of the United States at a most critical period in our political affairs.

Mr. President, I have not attempted any systematic discussion of this measure. But for the introduction of the amendment by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE] I should have said nothing whatever upon it. But the amendment is, to my mind, the redeeming feature of the bill, and the criticism which I would make of it is that it does not go far enough. I should prefer to declare for their immediate independence. I think the analysis by Moorfield Storey of the Democratic platform upon the subject, as read here by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], is absolutely unanswerable. We have promised, ever since there was a Philippine question—and when I say "we," I mean the party to which I belong—we have pledged and declared over and over again that if and when we were restored to power we would give these people their independence. Now, we either meant it or we did not. I do not think there is any question about our candor and earnestness in this repeated declaration of good faith. But there will be if we ignore or disregard it.

I am glad we made it. It is true Democratic doctrine. It is an essential to the welfare of the people from the Democratic standpoint. It has become crystallized as a fixed principle of Democratic policy that upon our accession to power we would get rid of these islands. The only way to carry out that pledge, Mr. President, is to keep it by fixing some definite, arbitrary time when, regardless of consequences, the present relations between this Government and the Philippine Islands will terminate, when we will get out of there and come home, and when from that time onward the people of the islands will be left to themselves, to govern themselves as in their judgment they should and to look after their affairs in their own way.

My objection to this amendment is that the time suggested is too long, and that no contingency should be attached to the date when the bill becomes operative. But I am not one of those who rejects half a loaf because he can not get all that he wants. I think this, perhaps, is the best thing that can be done at present, the most efficacious thing, the most practical thing. Therefore I shall support this amendment, Mr. President, believing that in so doing I am not only following the dictates of my own judgment with regard to the question, but I am also carrying out and making effective the oft-repeated declarations of the Democratic Party upon this subject. I trust that when we are rid of the Philippines, when we have that episode of our history behind us, we will have learned a lesson from that experience so strong and so vivid and so constant as to make its repetition impossible.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. STONE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, January 25, 1916, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## NOMINATIONS.

*Executive nominations received by the Senate January 24, 1916.*

## SECRETARIES OF EMBASSIES OR LEGATIONS.

## CLASS 4.

Francis White, of Maryland, now a secretary of embassy or legation of class 5, to be a secretary of embassy or legation of class 4 of the United States of America.

## CLASS 5.

John Heath, of Palo Alto, Cal., to be a secretary of embassy or legation of class 5 of the United States of America.

## APPRAISER OF MERCHANDISE.

Joseph T. Lyons, of Boston, Mass., to be appraiser of merchandise in customs collection district No. 4, with headquarters at Boston, Mass., in place of Winthrop T. Hodges, resigned.

## ASSISTANT APPRAISER OF MERCHANDISE.

Frederick J. Sullivan, of Lawrence, Mass., to be assistant appraiser of merchandise in customs collection district No. 4, with headquarters at Boston, Mass., in place of Joseph T. Lyons, nominated for appraiser of merchandise.

## SPECIAL EXAMINER OF DRUGS, ETC.

Dennis Flynn, of Lowell, Mass., to be special examiner of drugs, medicines, and chemicals and assistant appraiser of merchandise in customs collection district No. 4, with headquarters at Boston, Mass., in place of William H. Parker, resigned.

## PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Lieut. Charles W. Early to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 29th day of September, 1915.

Lieut. Wilson Brown, jr., to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 8th day of December, 1915.

Ensign Elmer De L. Langworthy to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 7th day of March, 1915.

Ensign Jefferson D. Smith to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 7th day of March, 1915.

Ensign Lawrence P. Bischoff to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 8th day of June, 1915.

Ensign Earl R. Morrissey to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 8th day of June, 1915.

Ensign Charles K. Osborne to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 8th day of June, 1915.

Asst. Paymaster Charles C. Copp to be a passed assistant paymaster in the Navy from the 23d day of September, 1915.

Carpenter William E. Fitzgerald to be a chief carpenter in the Navy from the 15th day of November, 1915.

## POSTMASTER.

## NEW JERSEY.

John F. Sinnott to be postmaster at Newark, N. J., in place of Frank J. Bock. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1916.

## CONFIRMATIONS.

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 24, 1916.*

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE.

Joseph T. Johnson to be United States district judge, western district of South Carolina.

## POSTMASTERS.

## MASSACHUSETTS.

Joseph F. McManus, Norwood.  
Martin Ratigan, Whitman.

## MONTANA.

Henry S. Paddock, Three Forks.

## NEW JERSEY.

James Degnan, High Bridge.

## OKLAHOMA.

J. L. Burke, Hobart.

## PENNSYLVANIA.

Howard Kemrer, Paradise.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, January 24, 1916.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We bless Thee, our Father in heaven, for the dignity Thou hast conferred upon man, for it is writ, "Thou hast made him a little lower than the angels, and hast crowned him with glory and honor; Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of Thy hands; Thou hast put all things under his feet."

Give us therefore the courage of our convictions that whatsoever we put our hands to this day we may glorify Thee and thus glorify ourselves in the work whereunto Thou hast called us, that Thy kingdom may come and Thy will be done in all our hearts; in the spirit of the Master. Amen.

The Journals of the proceedings of Saturday, January 22, 1916, and Sunday, January 23, 1916, were read and approved.

## PARCEL POST.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the subject of the parcel post.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record on the subject of the parcel post. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

## NATIONAL DEFENSE.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that to-morrow, after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of business on the Speaker's table, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes on the subject of preparedness and national defense.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asks unanimous consent that to-morrow, after the reading of the Journal and the clearing of the business on the Speaker's table, he be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes on the subject of national preparedness. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNET rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from New York rise?

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] I may address the House for 30 minutes upon the same general subject.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman to withhold that for another day. We are right in the middle of the consideration of the good-roads bill. If we do not finish the bill to-morrow it will run us into Calendar Wednesday, with other important matters coming up. Why can not the gentleman wait for a day or two?

Mr. BENNET. I ask for only 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BENNET] asks unanimous consent that after the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] he be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes on the same general subject of preparedness. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

## RURAL CREDITS.

Mr. HOWARD rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Georgia rise?

Mr. HOWARD. To submit a request for unanimous consent. I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the Record by publishing a letter from Hon. Charles Hall Davis, of Petersburg, Va., which is a criticism of H. R. 6838, known as the Moss rural-credit bill.